FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 249

27 December 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. Position on Siting Missiles in Europe Hit AA 1
[Zhukov in PRAVDA 23 Dec]
U.S. Attitude Toward Disarmament Talks Scored AA 4
[Falin IZVESTIYA 23 Dec]
Tikhvinskiy on Euromissile Implications AA 7
[Chugrov in IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]
TV Program on Effects, U.S. Views of Nuclear War AA 10
[Chervov, Vereshchetin]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Andrianov, Volskiy, Nekrasov]
U.S. Policy Reviewed CC 1
U.S. Seeks Domination CC 3
Soviet 'Peaceful Initiative' CC 4
Nonaligned Movement Hailed CC 5
'Studio 9' on U.S. Policy, INF Countermeasures CC 7
[Zorin, Zagladin, Kobysh]
'International Review' Hails Soviet 'Prestige' CC 22
[Bolshakov in PRAVDA 25 Dec]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

TASS Assails U.S. 'Obstructionist Approach' at UN A 1
[Vasilets]
U.S. Standing 'Weakening' [Matyash] A 2
Reagan Leading Campaign To Leave UNESCO [Ignatyev] A 3
More on Campaign Against UNESCO [Soltan] A 4
U.S. 'Dangerous Military Adventures' Viewed [Druzhinin] A 4
Eagleburger Remarks on Trudeau Spark 'Scandal' [Lyutiy] A 6
Ponomarev on 'Boorish Remarks' A 6
Soviet 'Ready To Deal With Any U.S. President' [Shishlin] A 7
'Sinister' Radio Project Rising in Michigan A 8
[Lyutiy]
Analyst Reviews Reagan Social Policies [Aleksandrov] A 9
Gosbank Chief Meets With Armand Hammer A 9
[IZVESTIYA 23 Dec]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan's Nakasone Government Loses, Regains Rule C 1
Government Resigns C 1
Nakasone Reelected C 1
New Cabinet Announced C 1
Election Results Assessed C 1
[Rashidov in IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]

Japanese Reject U.S. Base on Miyake Island C 3
DPRK Scores Cruise Missile Plan for S. Korea C 4

SOUTH ASIA

Soviet Involvement in Afghanistan Reviewed [Soltan] D 1
U.S. 'Military Aid' to Anti-Afghan 'Bandits' Scored D 4
U.S. 'Undeclared War' [Levchenko] D 5
Terrorist Incident in Afghanistan Detailed D 6
[Ustinov in IZVESTIYA 20 Dec]
Article Devoted to USSR Helicopter Pilots in DRA D 9
[Sukhodolskiy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]
DRA Policies Hailed for Improving Peasant Life [Plastun] D 10
Afghanistan Protests Pakistani Aid to 'Bandits' D 11

WESTERN EUROPE

Swedish TV Airs Program on Anti-Soviet Espionage G 1
Swedish Officials on Need for Nuclear Disarmament G 1
West European 'Criticism' of Reagan 'Increasing' G 2
[Serebrennikov]
British Public Concerned With Nuclear Threat G 3
[Biryukov]
Turkish Figures on Cruise Deployment Plans G 3
Spanish CP Delegates Criticize Congress Report G 4
[Chernyshev in PRAVDA 17 Dec]
Briefs: USSR, Norwegian Cooperation Group G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

'Arafat Departure from Tripoli 'Loss' for Arabs H 1
[Shishlin]
YAR President Receives PLO's 'Arafat in San'a' H 1
Palestinian Front Leader Speaks on Anniversary H 1
Syria's Al-Asad Stresses Freedom From Israel H 2
PLO's 'Abd Rabbuh Hits U.S. 'Militarist Course' H 3
[Zelenin, Levchenko]
W. European Public Demands Lebanese Withdrawal H 3
France, Britain 'Refuse' H 3
Italy Urges Withdrawal H 4
Algerian Party Congress Outcome Reviewed H 4
[Dudarev, Lagutin]
U.S. Official Calls for Al-Qadhdhafi's 'Removal' H 5
[Reshetnikov]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

SUPREME SOVIET

Opening Agenda for Supreme Soviet Session P 1
Registration of Supreme Soviet Deputies Begins P 1
Draft Plan, Budget Approved at Plenary Session P 1
Kuznetsov at Session P 2

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Held 26 Dec	R 1
TANJUG on Opening	R 1
Andropov Absent [AFP]	R 1
Andropov 'Address' [PRAVDA 27 Dec]	R 1
Report Debated; Plenum Ends	R 10
'Information Report' [PRAVDA 27 Dec]	R 10
Vorotnikov 'Promoted'; TASS Provides Biography	R 11
Solomentsev 'Promoted'; TASS Provides Biography	R 12
Discussion Themes for Supreme Soviet Elections [IZVESTIYA 21 Dec]	R 12
More Electoral Commission Nominations Listed [IZVESTIYA 23 Dec]	R 14
Moscow Rayon Report, Election Meetings Held [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Dec]	R 14
Grishin Addresses Moscow Party Committee Meeting	R 17
Armenian Party Leadership Changes Reported [TANJUG]	R 17
New Uzbek Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman	R 17

U.S. POSITION ON SITING MISSILES IN EUROPE HIT

PM261815 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by Political Observer Yuriy Zhukov: "When the Secret Comes Out in the Open: The Soap Bubble of the NATO 'Declaration'"]

[Text] No matter how hard the U.S. and NATO Leaders try to evade responsibility for wrecking the Geneva talks on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, they have not been and will not be able to succeed in this. Their latest trick -- the fraudulent game of love for peace which took the form of the NATO Council "declaration" which gives an assurance that the United States and its allies are supposedly prepared to take their seats once again at the negotiating table provided the Soviet delegation "returns" -- has also failed.

"The NATO 'political signal' for continuation of the talks will remain an empty phrase and a soap bubble for as long as the West fails to reevaluate its own policy and change it." This statement by Horst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic faction in the FRG Bundestag, published by PARLAMENTARISCH-POLITISCHE PRESSEDIENST, reflects a view on the NATO "declaration" which is becoming increasingly widespread in Europe and in the United States too.

The job of NATO propaganda services, which are still trying to present the actions by R. Reagan's administration as the "policy of the preferred hand," is in no way made any the easier by the cynical revelations by leading officials in the administration. They stubbornly repeat time and again that they intend to continue the siting of their nuclear missiles in West Europe "according to schedule." In regards to the Geneva talks, which were wrecked by the United States, P. Nitze, former leader of the U.S. delegation at these talks, took the liberty to state to AFP that "the only way" to resume the talks "consists of the Soviet Union accepting the fact that the United States and its NATO partners must (?!) site intermediate-range missiles."

Attempts to talk with the USSR in such a language have not been, are not, and will not be successful for those who are still nurturing the unrealizable dream of attaining military superiority over us so as to dictate their terms in the future. People in Washington are perfectly aware of this. Even when U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, for example, assured his West European colleagues in Brussels that his government is supposedly prepared to conduct arms control talks with the USSR "round any table, anywhere in the world," he was not believed even by many of his own compatriots.

"The Russians' mistrust for the White House," California's newspaper TRIBUNE wrote, "is based upon the view, which is not too far off the truth, that the Reagan administration looks at arms talks only as a cheap way of attaining nuclear superiority." And the newspaper went on to voice its alarm and to warn Washington: "We have survived one grim 'cold war' and could survive another one, but a 'hot war' is something else, and it is high time that the Reagan administration must understand that the 'ignition point' is quite near."

This is the voice of the U.S. West Coast, the current President's home base. And this is what the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, an influential newspaper on the U.S. East Coast, wrote in an editorial exposing the artless way in which the present U.S. leadership functions: "Thinking over the present intentions and moods of the Reagan administration, we have come to the following conclusion: It does not consider(!) it a politically urgent task to reach an arms agreement with the Soviet Union next year or after the end of Reagan's first presidency. It is hard to overestimate the significance of this."

This important conclusion by a newspaper reflecting the views of influential -- although not currently ruling in Washington -- political and economic circles of the United States, deserves to be heeded, especially since it is shared by eminent U.S. politicians who are well versed in the nature of the matter.

The conclusions of the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR editorial board coincide almost word for word with, for example, the statement by P. Warnke, former director of the U.S. Amrs Control and Disarmament Agency: "A Soviet-American agreement on medium-range weapons," he noted, "occupies a not-too-prominent position on the list of President Reagan's priorities. He would be happier siting weapons, rather than cutting them back."

Yes, everything indicates that the "Reagan team" did not even contemplate agreement in Geneva. The real development of the U.S. President's thinking reflects, as people in Washington note, the 21 percent increase in military expenditure, planned for next fiscal year by his administration.

So what was the purpose of the U.S. side in conducting talks in Geneva over the last 2 years and more? Only to gain time, which was needed by the military-industrial corporations to test and manufacture the new missiles and, at the same time, to pacify the U.S. and West European public whom, as THE NEW YORK TIMES observer J. Reston remarked, the incumbent President "is beginning to frighten...with his bellicose attitude toward the Russians."

In this connection, many U.S. political observers have now started to discuss in their articles the far from insignificant question about the banner beneath which the present master of the White House will enter the next presidential elections. It is well known that he hesitated for a long time, deliberating whether he should run for a second presidential term. But now, it is claimed in Washington, he has already decided the issue, insofar as the military adventures in Grenada and Lebanon, skillfully presented by his propaganda services as "victory over the forces of evil," have fanned a chauvinist mentality in the United States and thus helped to a certain extent in raising the popularity of this "man with the big stick."

Let us leave these claims to the conscience of their authors. Something else is important. In the past, all U.S. presidential candidates used to start, about a year before the elections, donning the snow-white mantle of advocates of peace and disarmament (in the fall of 1980 even Reagan paid lip service to this tactic by declaring that he would defend peace more successfully than Carter!) Now, however, judging by what is being said in Washington, Reagan intends -- if he is to run for a second presidential term -- to campaign to the accompaniment of drum-rolls, demanding further and further intensification of the arms race in the name of the "crusade" against communism.

As the very same CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR wrote in its editorial, "some people in the White House think that two presidential terms -- in other words 8 years -- is rather too long a time to manage without progress in arms control.

"But throughout the duration of Reagan's first presidential term -- assuming that at the end of January Reagan will, as expected, announce his campaign for reelection to a second term -- the administration can manage without it."

And so: THE ADMINISTRATION CAN MANAGE WITHOUT IT! [printed in boldface] So what is the value of the whining regrets, expressed by the NATO Council in its "declaration," over the fact that the Geneva talks have been broken off? What is the value of the statement made by P. Nitze at his Washington press conference that "The U.S. delegation is ready to return to Geneva at any time?"

It is being said, and not without justification, either, that all this is being done to placate the West European U.S. allies and silence the protests by antiwar movement members. The facts, however, prove that such expectations are groundless.

An interesting detail: Reagan administration officials are now eagerly handing out interviews to British, West German, and Italian newspapers. In the past, when journalists from the West European bourgeois press questioned highly placed U.S. officials, they asked only the questions the officials wished to answer. Now, however, these interviews increasingly often turn into fierce exchanges, so that you cannot understand who is doing the asking and who is doing the answering.

Quite recently, P. Nitze gave an interview to the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL. As usual, he started by saying that the Geneva talks were supposedly progressing well and that agreement would have been almost at hand, but suddenly the "Russians" spoiled everything.

DER SPIEGEL's correspondent was disinclined to agree with this rosy picture, and most undiplomatically, told Nitze that he has the reputation of a "hawk" even in the United States and is hardly suitable for constructive disarmament talks. But things did not end there. Interviewee and interviewer appeared to have changed places, and the altercation started:

DER SPIEGEL: So what went wrong in Geneva just now?

Nitze: It was wrong that the Russians...

DER SPIEGEL (Interrupting): Only the Russians?

Nitze: Yes, I think so...

DER SPIEGEL: Does it suit you to think so?

Nitze: No, No, it does not suit me to think. I really think so...

DER SPIEGEL: Nonetheless, a sufficiently large number of critics, both here, in the United States and, of course, in Europe, lay a significant portion of the blame for wrecking the talks if not on you personally then on the Reagan administration's stance on disarmament and the arms control issue.... Your President has left no doubt that he was not even thinking of a compromise in Geneva.

Weinberger himself was treated similarly by a correspondent from the West German NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG: During the course of an interview he was frankly told that the opponents of the NATO "arms upgrading" and the "U.S. course in security policy" are convinced that "the U.S. leadership has shifted from the strategy of preventing war to the strategy of waging war."

It is in the interests of its "strategy of war" that the present U.S. Administration pushing on regardless, is sending its new nuclear missiles across the ocean. It is in the interests of its "strategy of war" that it requires its allies to increase their military expenditure still more. It is in the interests of its "strategy of war" that it is preparing to turn West Europe into its "theater of combat operations."

People are not blind. They can see the fate being prepared for them by the advocates of this strategy, who have lost their heads. This is why the antimissile campaign in West Europe is not only not dying down (and people in Washington were convinced that it would die down no sooner had the Pentagon delivered its new missiles there!) but is, on the contrary, spreading and becoming increasingly dynamic.

No clever maneuvering will help the U.S. Administration shift the responsibility for breaking off the talks on medium-range nuclear means in Europe from the U.S. side to the Soviet. Now that the secret has come out into the open, when the U.S. bourgeois press itself has admitted that Reagan was not even thinking seriously of limiting nuclear arms in Europe and his diplomats were conducting talks only to distract attention, alarm in Europe is growing.

Having condemned the hypocritical NATO Council "declaration" and its appeal to the USSR "to return to Geneva" as a shameless propaganda maneuver, the FRG communist newspaper UNSERE ZEIT wrote a few days ago:

"There is only one way which can lead to improving in the situation: restitution of the conditions existing prior to the siting of U.S. missiles. This is a natural precondition for the Soviet Union to renounce its countermeasures and for its specific and realistic proposals on limiting nuclear arms in Europe to come back in force. The barriers which have risen in connection with the siting of missiles must be taken down by those who raised them. And so, it is up to Washington."

We cannot but agree with this reasonable opinion.

U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD DISARMAMENT TALKS SCORED

PM231512 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Valentin Falin article under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "On the Question of Talks"]

[Text] In December, practically the most fashionable word in the lexicon of NATO diplomacy and propaganda was the word "talks." They declined it and conjugated it, used it in the subjunctive and the indicative moods, included it in presidential and ministerial speeches, and added it to articles and commentaries by specialists. R. Reagan, who wasted the first 2 years of his presidency on upsetting the machinery of cooperation with the socialist East and wrecking the system of agreements with the Soviet Union, suddenly pronounced at the end of the third year: "The United States will never leave the talks table. Peace is too important. Commonsense requires...." How many times Washington has defied common sense and slammed the door, leaving the talks; how many times it has asserted that there are things more important than peace, and suddenly here is a panegyric for talks, and without even the formerly invariable addition of "from a position of strength." The President is echoed by Weinberger and McFarlane, Nitze and Rowney.

Perhaps the White House chief has gotten tired of piling up mountains of weapons, or "experience, born of serious mistakes" has prompted him to come down from the imperial clouds to the firm soil of reality? Alas. Neither of these. The President is attracted not by talks in themselves, but only by the kind of talks which are an utter waste of breath. And the more constructive energy is squandered in this way, the better he likes the talks and the more they are spun out.

From the viewpoint of common sense, which R. Reagan mentioned by way of showing off, it is absurd. Unnatural, even, assuming that official Washington's common sense bears some resemblance to the ordinary kind. But the problem is that there is no resemblance. When the United States tramples on defenseless Grenada or -- as now -- kills Lebanese, Palestinians, and Syrians, that is fair, because it is being done in the name of U.S. imperialism's "vital interests." But it is extremely unfair, downright disgraceful, if the Lebanese and Syrians shoot back. They are punished for their obstinancy according to the 16-inch gun version of justice.

And look what the neoconservatives have made of equitability, equality, and similar concepts! Who said equality means leveling down? The Pentagon figures give it to you straight from the shoulder: We will not allow the West Europeans to decide what the United States is allowed or not allowed to do. The State Department chooses its phrases rather more courteously. The White House tries to keep to the middle way if it can. If you all emulate Washington, its interests, policy, and ideology, you will find the result is a wonderful equality. They attempted without prior consultation to extend internal U.S. jurisdiction to the allies and use sanctions against the obstinate ones. At the first try, they failed, but the desire to "level out people's rights" has not disappeared.

If you grab your closest friends in a clinch, what can stop you when it comes to your enemies? Here equality is derived from equilibrium, and equilibrium is a variable quantity depending on the development of U.S. military doctrines.

In the fifties and sixties, for instance, the United States had manifold superiority over the Soviet Union in nuclear facilities, and nobody in the NATO capitals breathed a word about "superarmaments." On the contrary, the allies, following their leader, spoke boldly of "equilibrium" and the usefulness of strengthening it.

When detente came on to the scene, so did a more objective denominator for evaluating equilibrium. It was embodied in the principle of equality and identical security and the renunciation of the desire for military superiority. This was not to the liking of R. Reagan and the circles which back him. I recall a statement by the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. "The President points out quite clearly," K. Adelman stressed in September, "that he will never make a recommendation to ratify the SALT II Treaty. It seems to me that if that were done, it would be a dangerous precedent for future arms control talks, since the criteria provided for in the SALT II Treaty would be used, and SALT II would thus become something like the supreme law for our country..."

Behind these bald phrases is a whole program. The present U.S. leadership object not to specific features of the SALT process or to individual provisions in the treaty elaborated as a result of 7 years' hard work, but to the fundamental principles (criteria) of the quality of the sides and their identical rights and duties. These principles are now characterized as dangerous. And you have to combat dangers.

The end engenders the means. Talks from a position of equality were rejected. "Talks from a position of strength" were declared to be the true way to "genuine arms control" ("build-down") and to "true detente" (through the whipping up of tension). Strength on one side at talks presupposes relative or absolute weakness on the other side. Such talks are oriented not toward agreement, that is, the voluntary consensus of the participants to their mutual satisfaction, but toward sanctifying the usurpation of all the pluses by one side and the deduction of all the minuses from the other. Perhaps such a method of conducting affairs has some chance of taking root on NATO soil. But in the Soviet Union this trick has not worked before and will not work in future. The lessons of the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe are confirmation of this.

Has not Washington changed its mind? Is not this why, in the latest choral performances by NATO and the solo parts by the bloc leaders, the theme of talks has been purged of the alien accretion of strength? No, that is not the reason. In certain circumstances strong words become superfluous and at times harmful. Having embarked on undermining the foundations of strategic stability, you can rhetorically shine with magnanimity. Talks? Yes, please. Wherever and whenever it suits the Soviet Union: at any level acceptable to Moscow. Sounds good. Particularly if, every time, you tack on the phrase "for the sake of peace." But this is a false brilliance, and false too are the revelations of P. Nitze, who assures the public that the Geneva talks were broken off at the moment when the ripe, succulent fruit was ready to fall from the tree of wisdom. People wondered precisely what kind of fruit Nitze had in mind, and it turned out that the fruit belongs to the nuclear umbrella genus of American first-strike systems. What a good fruit!

They use all kinds of tricks to pass off vice as virtue and make the West Europeans coexist with Pershings and cruise missiles. And they scatter warnings in our direction: The sword of Damocles is hanging over you, you must get yourselves out of it. Give up hope, they say, of equality in the usual sense, accept equality Reagan-style. Moscow is more in need of talks. Having placed its new missiles in combat positions, Washington will do very well without talks.

For some time to come Washington will probably refer from time to time, for the sake of decency, to the de facto "observance" of the SALT II Treaty. But whereas until now R. Reagan's administration has largely been destroying the political and moral framework of the strategic arms limitation program and its legal basis, the arrival of the first American missiles in the FRG, Britain, and Italy calls into question the material essence of the SALT II Treaty, which translated the principle of identical security into the hard language of facts. A duplicate American strategic potential is being drawn up, presupposing equivalent countermeasures on the Soviet side.

None of this need have happened. Strong-arm confrontation is not preordained for West and East.

Not long ago Prof N.M. Amosov wrote in IZVESTIYA: "I.P. Pavlov proved that animals have a 'goal reflex.' A dog digs till it has finished digging. In man, all this is reinforced, elevated, enriched by his social history, his social life." Perhaps. But what if it is not enhanced, but brought down, if strength and tyranny are elevated respectively to a cult and right? If J.W. Goethe was right, and man was given reason that he might surpass any beast in savagery? If Washington believes in nothing but strength and sometimes money? There is something to think about when you hear the unctuous speeches from across the ocean about talks, or rather pseudotalks.

TIKHVINSKIY ON EUROMISSILE IMPLICATIONS

PM231043 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with S.L. Tikhvinskiy, academic secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department and rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy, by own correspondent S. Chugrov under the "IZVESTIYA Interview" rubric: "Believing in the Force of Reason" -- date, place not given]

[Text] A struggle for people's hearts and minds is underway in the world. This statement by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is a fitting response to the anticommunist crusaders who are trying to intimidate the peoples with Pershing and cruise missiles. Increasingly, all those who prize peace are turning to this document and are studying and analyzing it. Your IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Chugrov has put a number of questions to S.L. Tikhvinskiy, chairman of the USSR National Committee of Historians, academic secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department, and rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy.

"It is a secret to no one," S.L. Tikhvinskiy said, beginning our conversation, "that the prevailing situation in the world is extremely serious. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement is filled with a spirit of concern for the future of human society. 'Human reason alone can and must save humanity from the awesome danger,' Yu. V. Andropov emphasized. And we Soviet people believe in this mighty force."

Question: Could you, as a historian, draw some historical parallels with the present?

Answer: It is horrifying to recall the enormous number of wars which people have had to endure throughout civilization's existence. Time and again weapons systems have been perfected with which people have destroyed each other. It is the case that whole peoples have disappeared from the face of the earth. The disasters brought by World War I and World War II in the 20th century are innumerable.

However, it is unfortunately precisely by means of historical analogies that some Western political scientists are trying to prove that a "limited" or "localized" nuclear war is not a terrifying prospect. There have been catastrophes in the world and mankind has overcome them, they maintain: There were the Huns, the Vandals, the invasion by Genghis Khan's Golden Horde, and the crusades, but ultimately everything returned to what it was before.

These Western political scientists forget, however, that we are living in peculiar times: No matter how destructive the military conflicts of the past might have been, there always remained victors after them, the human race continued. Matters are different today, inasmuch as nuclear conflict can bring about the destruction of the entire population of the earth.

I believe it is impossible to draw sufficiently strict historical parallels with the present moment: People today have in their hands weapons of incomparable destructive force. It is precisely this danger that Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's statement makes us aware of.

Question: Do the U.S. leaders, in your view, fully appreciate the danger of nuclear catastrophe?

Answer: Appreciation of this evident truth was and remains characteristic of many politicans and statesmen in capitalist countries, including representatives of the U.S. ruling elite.

President John Kennedy, for example, in his time reasoned highly realistically, saying that in our century "total war is senseless," since the consequences of nuclear explosions would be fatal for human civilization, and, as he said, "will affect even those generations not yet born."

But when the present U.S. leaders state that the Soviet Union is an "empire of evil" which must be destroyed, these words are not only to be taken as an oratorical device but as the specific military, political, strategic aim of U.S. imperialism. The truth is increasingly being confirmed that the reasoning of those forces who are at the helm of power in the United States is being clouded by a morbid hatred of progress and socialism.

Question: But our people have more than once found themselves confronted by terrible danger...

Answer: If we turn to our country's history, we find confirmation of the fact that during years of severe trials the peoples of Russia have always been distinguished by a high combat spirit, a growing feeling of patriotism, and unity so as to decisively repel the external enemy. Russia has never acted as an aggressor. But although Russia has itself been subjected many times to treacherous, surprise attack, it has ultimately always found the strength to assert its freedom and independence. This was true of the difficult period of struggle against the nomadic hordes, the years of the time of troubles, as well as the years of the Patriotic War of 1812. It was also true of the years of the intervention by 14 imperialist powers against the young state of the working people, and of those of the Great Patriotic War. And during the cold war period the U.S. ruling circles tried to blackmail us with the nuclear threat. Soviet people highly value and revere the centuries-old traditions of the peoples of Russia and see them as a source of their tenacity and strength. The attempts of war propagandists to intimidate our people are futile.

Question: How do you assess U.S. pressure on the West European countries?

Answer: Goebbels' propaganda at one time invented many anticommunist and anti-Soviet devices and cliches. Hitler and his accomplices, when starting their aggression against the Soviet Union, tried to persuade the whole world that they had embarked on saving everyone from communism, from the "Red plague." And now we have American propaganda fully armed with this leitmotiv: Our country is called a "threat to civilization," whereas the efforts to deploy American missiles in West Europe are described as a kind of rescue mission.

Question: How did it happen that the legislators of a number of West Europe states rubber-stamped the decision to deploy American missiles against the will of the peoples of their countries?

Answer: That was the result of American economic and propaganda pressure plus, of course, the recklessness of many Western politicians and their inability to deal with the economic and social crisis which the whole world capitalist system is going through. In furthering the American proposals they thus betrayed their own countries' national interests.

In these conditions it is useful to recall that it was the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces which saved Europe from the fascist plague. The USSR has not taken any actions threatening the social system in West Europe. The whole of our foreign policy is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and is aimed at peaceful competition between the socioeconomic systems.

Question: You constantly refer to historical examples. But, after all, there was an antiwar movement in Europe even before World War II...

Answer: Yes. The closest analogy (and I reiterate that analogies are completely impossible here) is with the end of the thirties. There was indeed an antiwar movement before World War II. Prominent European cultural figures -- Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, and many others -- opposed the threat of war. But the "Munichites," the advocates of a deal with Hitler and the rechanneling of fascist aggression against the Soviet Union, exploited the fragmentary nature of the antiwar movement, the sectarian stances adopted by its participants, and their refusal to unite into a single powerful anti-Hitler front. It is very important that today's antiwar movement, which comprises trade unions, young people, representatives of science and culture, representatives of pacifist organizations, and church figures, do not repeat this error. It is important that the forces or war do not succeed in splitting the antiwar movement's ranks and that all the opponents of war have a realistic picture of the enormous threat to which American imperialism is subjecting the countries of Europe by deploying the missiles and trying to achieve military superiority over the socialist world.

Question: Quite a number of sincere opponents of war think that the United States and the Soviet Union bear equal responsibility for the increased international tension. What can you say about this?

Answer: This standpoint does indeed exist. George Kennan, the prominent American diplomat, historian, and former U.S. ambassador to the USSR, for example, correctly recognises that "military rivalry is deadly dangerous because the war which it may easily lead to is a war in which...there can be no victory but only utter catastrophe for all." But even here he deliberately avoids replying directly to the question of who is the perpetrator of this unprecedented arms race and who is creating danger for the whole world, coming as he does to the conclusion that the actions of "unpredictable historical forces" underlie the deterioration of the international situation.

We Marxists know precisely what the answer is: It is not any sort of "unpredictable force" which underlies the prevailing situation but precisely the aggressive policy of the present American Administration, which is trying to upset the existing military equilibrium by force and create a "pax Americana" on its ruins.

Such aims are fundamentally alien to the Soviet Union. But Washington's propagandists are making considerable efforts to conceal the truth from the international public and to mislead them. Their aims are clear: In spreading fabrications about the "two powers' equal responsibility," they are thus seeking to divert the peace supporters' movement from the correct course and severely reduce its effectiveness. Have their actions been successful? I think the realities of the present provide the answer to this: The movement protesting American nuclear missiles in West Europe is just gathering momentum.

Question: Sergey Leonidovich, will the deployment of American missiles in West Europe have an effect on the development of our relations with these countries?

Answer: Naturally, the deployment of the missiles on European territory cannot fail to bring about qualitative changes in the USSR's relations with those countries which have willingly allowed American missiles to be placed on their territory. This, unfortunately, is also likely to be reflected in the development of scientific and cultural ties. How can one really develop contacts with countries which act as a forward bridgehead for undisguised aggression against the USSR? I think that this action by Washington, if it succeeds in implementing it, will have long-term negative consequences. The missile deployment strikes at everything that was so patiently created during the years of detente, and strikes at the Helsinki Conference's Final Act.

Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's 24 November statement is a document of exceptional historical importance. It is an appeal to reason addressed essentially to all the peoples of our planet. The Soviet Union, as we know, has never sought nor will it seek military superiority. But the calculations of those who are urging the world along the path of an increasingly dangerous arms race in order -- once they have achieved superiority -- to dictate their will to other peoples and states are unrealizable.

TV PROGRAM ON EFFECTS, U.S. VIEWS OF NUCLEAR WAR

LD230646 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Dec 83

[From the "Two Worlds, Two Policies" series featured in the "Leninist University of Millions" program; with unidentified moderator; Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, identified as chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces; and V.S. Vereshchetin, identified as deputy director of the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Jurisprudence -- date, place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Moderator] We are already living in too fragile a world. Only human sense can and must protect mankind from the menacing danger. That is a quotation from the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich. On more than one occasion, at various stages of history, the Soviet leadership has appealed to the politicians and strategists of the Western powers, asking them to show sense. Question: What reasons prompted the issuing of such an important political document?

[Chervov] The persistence of the Soviet Union's struggle to outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons is well known. For the sake of this goal the Soviet Union is prepared to embark on a very bold solution, provided there is goodwill on the part of the United States. This solution would make Europe free altogether of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. Under it the strategic nuclear arsenals of the sides would be reduced by more than a quarter. Production of nuclear weapons would be halted and then stocks of nuclear weapons would be gradually liquidated. The Soviet Union appealed to the other nuclear states, asking them to freeze nuclear weapons both quantitatively and qualitatively. The Soviet Union unilaterally gave a historic undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and appealed to the other nuclear states, above all the United States, to follow this example. The enunciation of the Soviet Union's initiatives could be continued. And we, the Soviet people, are proud of these initiatives since they all serve to strengthen the peoples' peace and security.

[Moderator] Washington is either ignoring our peace initiatives or is distorting them and misleading world public opinion. Question: What have the U.S. ruling circles themselves offered mankind in the sphere of nuclear disarmament?

[Chervov] They frustrated the ratification of the SALT II treaty. They are still deliberately refusing to ratify the 1974 treaty on the limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons. They have not ratified the 1976 treaty on the peaceful use of underground nuclear explosions. They have broken off the talks on a complete and universal ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and are refusing to resume them. The Reagan administration is categorically refusing to give an undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is against the freezing of nuclear armaments and against the reduction of nuclear armaments. The administration has now wrecked the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe. It is effectively working towards the same at the talks on the problem of strategic armaments as well.

[Moderator] Question: How can one explain the United States' stubborn reluctance to reach agreement with the Soviet Union?

[Cherkov] The reason can be found in official documents and in the speeches of the leaders of the U.S. Administration. When entering the White House in 1980, President Reagan defined his military-political criteria in the following manner. I ask you to pay attention to this: Here is the first criterion: America must lead the world and arrange the world along American lines, solely on the basis of strength. Here is the second criterion: An acceptable condition for relations with Moscow is the restoration, at any price, of a security margin -- in other words, complete and undisputed military superiority over the Soviet Union. The foremost task of my government, Reagan said, will be a program for the rearmament of America, so that we are the number one military power. Third: The Pentagon's plans should envisage various options for the use of nuclear weapons, including selective, limited and unlimited use, and so on. President Reagan declared that he fully accepts the possibility of limited nuclear war in Europe. Moreover, according to a Pentagon directive, the United States must come out on top and be able to force the Soviet Union to cease hostilities within a short space of time. Fourth: The White House will assign a secondary role to the questions of limiting nuclear armaments. If the need arises during the implementation of military programs, the administration will resort to any measures, even the renunciation of agreements already signed with the Soviet Union.

That was Reagan's election platform. Now all these militaristic objectives are being implemented in practice. The unprecedented building of the United States military potential is subordinate to one goal: to try to attain military superiority and then, by threatening the use of force, to dictate its wishes to other peoples and states.

[Moderator] This is the Near East. There is shooting. There are explosions and destruction is caused. Here is what THE WASHINGTON POST wrote in 1981: Whatever one may say about whether postwar U.S. interventions were justified or not, one thing is certain -- they were hardly ever successful. Democratic and Republican administrations never failed to support regimes doomed to defeat. Nevertheless, it may turn out that the Reagan administration will write several more chapters in the dismal history of our blunders in foreign policy.

The newspaper's words were prophetic. The tramp of U.S. boots is very familiar to the Lebanese and to the Grenadians. They have left their mark in El Salvador, and in the vicinity of Nicaragua. Not infrequently one can make out the imprints of elegant civilian shoes belonging to high-ranking military officials, even those of Weinberger, the Pentagon boss, alongside those made by a rough soldier's boot. [Words indistinct] so to speak, for the terrain -- not one's own, of course, but terrain from which it is easier to rake the fire. Admittedly, they are not using their own hands to do it. But, basically, those warming their hands are those who are marking bridgeheads for more and more interventions. The dollar works for war. War is being turned into profitable business. The anti-people regime of El Salvador receives dollar injections. There is no need to be sparing with the bullets. Murder has been legitimized and is generously rewarded by Washington.

Having declared the people's struggle for freedom and independence to be international terrorism, the Reagan administration did not realize that it had taken an ax to a branch on which it was itself sitting. The policy of intervention has become synonymous with the United States' state-sponsored terrorism.

Grenada: Until recently sports matches were held at this stadium. The American warriors have decided to play a different game here, a game of revenge or, to be more accurate, reprisal against a tiny sovereign state. They are making up for their failures in other regions. This is the United States' peace mission: Evidently Reagan visualized a similar picture when he formed the intention of casting socialism, as a social system, on the rubbish heap of history. Question: What is the true picture of relations between the United States and the USSR from the point of view of international law?

[Vereshchetin] The statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov showed quite clearly and precisely who is really guided by the stipulations of international law and advocates peace and security for the peoples and who has placed reliance on force in international relations, forgetting where the people who adopted this inglorious path in the past ended up. One of the principal foundations of international law, which has taken shape over the centuries, is the principle that says that treaties should be adhered to. As it happens, the U.S. Constitution says that treaties signed and ratified by the United States become part of U.S. law. In other words, they are also binding from the point of view of the U.S. Constitution.

I will mention a few examples. I am holding the text of an agreement signed by the Soviet Union and the United States 10 years ago, in 1973. It is about the prevention of nuclear war. Article 1 in this agreement says that the sides agree that they will act in such a way as to prevent the emergence of a situation capable of causing a dangerous exacerbation of their relations and to avoid military confrontations in order to rule out an outbreak of nuclear war between them. The U.S. Government adopted a policy of seeking military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union in spite of this principle of equality and identical security. It is doing all it can to attain this superiority on land and at sea. It is now trying to extend the arms race to space as well, using methods which, incidentally, are also banned by existing Soviet-U.S. agreements. It seems to me that from these examples alone one can see that the United States is violating in a most flagrant way its obligations under international agreements and violating the principles of international law and its own Constitution.

[Moderator] For centuries man has marvelled at the beauty of his earth. For centuries he has used his talent and the skill of his hands to multiply its natural beauty. But as the centuries have gone by, he has unfortunately improved his weapons. The wonderful representation of man's creation has been scarred by the ugly grimaces of war.

Here you see rare film taken recently from the archives of one of the most civilized states of the world. Note that the film is in color.

[Film shows devastated town and survivors] We have heard and read a lot about Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We have seen quite a lot of newsreel, but it was always in black and white. It transpirers that even in 1945 American correspondents were taking color film of the consequences of the atomic bombing of those Japanese towns. In one well-known episode of the time, a correspondent of a Japanese newspaper, who had been told to make a photo-reportage about the aftermath of the atomic tragedy, returned without carrying out this assignment. This cannot be filmed, he declared. The picture of cities reduced to ashes was so awful. But the Americans filmed it and even did so in color, as you can see. But for a long time the details of this barbaric action were kept secret from the public. Much has changed since then.

The subject of the nuclear nightmare is now being exploited more and more intensively by U.S. entertainment film industry. The threat, of coure, stems from the Soviet Union and the United States is forced to defend itself by inflicting a relaliatory strike. But America was literally galvanized by the new TV film called "The Day After." The title refers to the day after a nuclear conflict. You are seeing part of this film. The picture stirred up a wave of mass protests against the nuclear policy of the U.S. Government. Americans have now realized what the unfortunate victims of Horoshima and Nagasaki suffered. The mask of abstract and remote war suddenly showed the face of war as it could be today. Question: Most people on earth want to live in peace; is it really not at all possible to resolve this problem round the negotiating table?

[Chervov] I shall mention some facts. The Soviet Union has great experience of negotiations on nuclear armaments with various U.S. administrations, those of Nixon, Ford, and Carter. We had arguments and contradictions. But in spite of that the Americans listened at that time to the views of their partner. We saw the point and purpose of the talks. What were the Soviet-U.S. talks of the 1970's based on? The most important thing was the principle of equality and identical security. The sides approached the solution of the problem realistically and, by and large, took account of each other's security interests. The SALT I, SALT II and other accords were reached for this reason.

[Moderator] Question: Why is compromise not possible now?

[Chervov] Because they do not want compromise. They are going straight for military superiority. They are putting forward deliberately unacceptable proposals aimed at the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union. All the statements by the Washington leaders about their alleged readiness to negotiate seriously about a radical reduction in armaments are deception and a two-faced policy. In actual fact there is nothing of the kind. At the present time the United States and its allies have a different approach to the talks. The principle of equality and identical security has been officially cast aside. And this, after all, is a violation of all the documents that have already been signed, including the SALT II treaty, which the current U.S. Administration did not ratify but pledged to observe. The interests of the Soviet Union are being ignored now. The United States now has a single line, that of forcing, compelling the Soviet Union to accept one-sided conditions, and of gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union.

That is precisely how the U.S. side behaved during the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe. For 2 years it sought just one thing. It wanted to see how many U.S. missiles and of which categories it could deploy in Europe. In seeking to deploy its missiles at all costs the United States was unwilling to reach agreement on a reduction of medium-range nuclear armaments. It deliberately worked to wreck the talks -- and it did wreck them.

The U.S. Administration has now also driven the talks on the problem of strategic armaments into a dead end. The entire purpose of the U.S. approach in this sphere is to seek the elimination of almost all our ICBM's; in other words, to undermine the basis of the combat might of Soviet strategic nuclear forces, and to upset the existing parity in its own favor. The implementation of the U.S. proposals would in practice give the United States a 50-percent superiority over the Soviet Union in launch vehicles and a superiority of over 150 percent in nuclear warheads.

[Moderator] Question: Does the United States realize that its one-sided approach has created a hopeless position at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments?

[Chervov] They are unquestionably aware of that. What is more, that is what they are striving for. Adelman, the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, frankly stated, and I quote: The talks on arms limitation are a trick to which we have merely been forced to resort in order to reassure the American people and European allies. I do not think that any comment on that is needed.

[Moderator] It would do no harm if the NATO partners, which have accepted the U.S. policy of sharing out the atomic risk, were to remember the words of U.S. President Lincoln in the middle of the 19th century: You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all the time. An example of how right these words were is provided by the unprecedented upsurge in the antiwar movement in Western countries. More and more people are now coming to understand that if the arms race is not curbed, it will destroy all mankind.

At a conference at the Pentagon, a senior representative of the U.S. Navy solemnly declared: People are talking as if a nuclear war would mean the end of the world. In actual fact only 500 million people would perish. Within one generation, genetic engineering will make people immune from radiation. But they will simply be like robots, not human beings. And robot-like American GI thugs are already appearing in various parts of the planet. But what is even one individual life worth to them when 500 million are a trifle?

Here is what one Western paper wrote: If the Tunguska meteorite had landed 4 hours 47 minutes earlier, it might have changed the course of world history. It would then have landed on Petrograd, which was already the center of world communism at that time. Yet again we have the Soviet threat -- and in what a wrapping! It is better to have a desert than communism! But the USSR threatens no one and does not strive for military superiority. Question: Is it not possible for the West to regard this as a success for its policy of seeking the economic attrition of the USSR?

[Chervov] In view of the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe, the socialist countries have been obliged to take effective retaliatory measures. These measures have been clearly set out in the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. These countermeasures are aimed at preventing a disturbance of the military equilibrium in favor of the United States and NATO and thereby at safeguarding security and peace in Europe. The Soviet Union has all it needs to stand up to any military threat from imperialism. Our defense might is maintained at the level necessary to safeguard the peaceful labor of Soviet people. The statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said that our country's defense capability is at such a level that no one would be advised to arrange to test that strength.

[Moderator] No revolution, Lenin said, is worth anything unless it knows how to defend itself. More than one attempt has been made to arrange a trial of strength with the Soviet Republic. Attempts were made in 1918, 1920, and 1922. An attempt was made in 1941. One thing they failed to learn: The people cannot be defeated. Yes, indeed, attempts were made. These shots show the meeting on the Elbe, the anti-Hilter coalition, and the joint victory. The long-awaited peace arrived and with it the undying sorrow for those who died. Twenty million lives is quite a price to pay. The veterans of the Great Patriotic War are our pride. They are the custodians of the heroic traditions of the people. They have worthy successors. No revolution, Lenin said, is worth anything unless it knows how to defend itself. We have something to defend. We have the things to defend ourselves with. We have the people to defend us. We lack just one thing: The intention of attacking anybody. We threaten nobody. But we would not advise anybody to arrange a fresh trial of strength.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD251725 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 25 Dec 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Boris Andrianov, all-union radio foreign affairs commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST international observer]

U.S. Policy Reviewed

[Text] [Andrianov] This meeting completes the cycle of our broadcasts in 1983. We who are participating feel that there is reason to look back and reflect on the most important events that have determined the international situation at various stages this year.

[Nekrasov] As we stand at the threshold of the new year, one feels a quite understandable desire to take a broader look at what is happening today, and form an impression of it, not only as the sum of events, but also as a long-term process -- a process conditioned by the influence of deeper causes. We know that the tension in international relations is not something that has only arisen in the last months of this year. Currently, it has become noticeably greater and assumed a particularly dangerous character. What does one want to draw attention to in this connection? The main tendencies of the actions of the U.S. militarist forces have become perfectly obvious. They are, first: large-scale military preparations; an open and -- I should say -- impudent course toward achieving military superiority of the United States and of the NATO bloc as a whole -- which, in the view of the bosses of modern monopolistic capital, would enable them, in the foreseeable future, to defeat socialism as a social system, and so restore the worldwide domination of the system based on a society depending upon private property. Secondly, the course toward totally unconcealed interference by force -- mainly military force -- in the internal affairs of sovereign states in whatever part of the world they may be -- interference that recognizes neither frontiers, nor the norms of international law, nor the rules and customs of international behavior accepted by the people.

[Andrianov] What inevitably comes to mind in this connection is what you might call the constant leitmotiv of numerous statements by President Reagan during the past year: Peace must be based on force. This idea was reiterated and varied in his speeches, radio and television appearances, and a multitude of interviews. And the U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, elaborated on this notion by saying that the United States must strengthen its position in the world with the help of arms. Only a U.S. military advantage, he claimed, would make it possible to preserve peace.

[Nekrasov] Yet the preservation and strengthening of universal peace is the last thing they had any thought of across the ocean. That was shown by the U.S. approach to the highly important talks that were being held throughout the year -- the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear armaments in Europe and the talks on limiting and reducing strategic armaments between our country and the United States. Quite a lot has recently been said about all this in our press. High-ranking U.S. representatives have themselves, at times, blurted out the truth. Thus, it is impossible not to recall today the words of Adelman concerning Washington's approach to the vital talks with the Soviet Union: Arms limitation talks, he said, are a trick we are simply forced to resort to in order to reassure the American people and our European allies. It would be difficult to put it more clearly than that! It was said by none other than the man President Reagan appointed to head the government Arms Control and Disarmament Agency - i.e., the body entrusted with actually directing those talks.

[Andrianov] It is perfectly plain that, in those circumstances, the Soviet Union could not be an accomplice to deceiving the people by means of talks that were leading nowhere. The Soviet Union was forced to withdraw from the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons, and to break off the talks on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments without announcing a date for their resumption. Our country has been forced to begin implementing appropriate measures to provide both for its own security and for that of other countries of our socialist community.

[Nekrasov] No other decision could have been taken in a situation in which Washington, recklessly gambling with the fate of the people, has already in fact begun deploying its new first-strike missiles in Europe -- thereby destabilizing and aggravating still further the whole international situation. At the same time, across the ocean, they put into effect the arms race programs that had been previously drawn up.

Well, to complete the picture, comrades, there are two more features of the past year that I would like to add: first, that international imperialism has demonstrated a tendency to act jointly, or in a concerted way, in international affairs. This was seen during the meeting of the leaders of the seven major capitalist states that was held in May in the small U.S. town of Williamsburg, where the main subject was the question of strengthening the solidarity of the Western World in the face of the notorious -- fictitious -- Soviet military threat. It was seen, too, in the complicity of the ruling circles of Britan, West Germany and Italy, and of a number of other West European countries, in the deployment of new U.S. missiles. It was manifested again at the recent session of the NATO council in Brussels, where the plans to continue the nuclear and conventional arms race in Europe, which Washington is foisting on the other members of NATO, were "rubber-stamped."

Second, one cannot forget to mention the frenzied anti-Soviet orgy that was typical of the sociopolitical atmosphere in the West -- especially the United States -- and which was being whipped up by the ruling circles of the Western capitals and inflated by all mass propaganda media. I have in front of me that text of a press conference given in Washington a week ago by the new National Security Adviser to the President Robert McFarlane. I read from his statement "no one in the administration thinks the Soviet Union wants war. The Soviet leaders are very intelligent, well-informed, sensible and practical men." Yes -- that what he said. You might not believe your eyes..as they say, if you didn't read what McFarlane went on to say. What followed was a call, addressed to the Soviet Union, to weigh all the circumstances, and return to the conference table with the U.S. -- and agree, furthermore, to conduct the talks on the conditions that Washington intends to dictate.

Of course, nothing will come of that. But what do the statements I've quoted indicate, if taken by themselves? Above all, undoubtedly, they show a desire to deceive the Western public by means of Washington's supposed wish to hold talks -- to represent themselves as doves of peace. But that is not all. Clearly underlying them is the confusion felt today in Washington and other Western capitals in the face of the firm and principled position of our country.

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, quite rightly, in reviewing the year, we devote great and serious attention to the very dangerous problem of the deployment of the U.S. Euromissiles. But I think we should also note that really, what is going on amounts to concealed intervention -- a manifestation of the interventionist course of the United States, a course towards introducing everywhere U.S. military presence and control.

This is actually the practical part of the crusade proclaimed by the Reagan administration. But whereas in Europe, this notorious crusade is, as yet, still in the stage of preparations -- exceedingly dangerous, but still, preparations not military operations -- on the other hand, in the hotspots of Asia, Africa and South America, it has, in the past year, taken the form of a campaign in the direct, military sense of the world -- and in several directions at once.

U.S. Seeks 'Domination'

And it must be said that the invasion of Grenada and the provocations against Nicaragua, and naturally the shelling and bombing in Lebanon, all this could prove to be just a prelude to wider aggressive action by U.S. imperialism in the developing world, and that is something press organs and certain Washington politicans are already saying openly today. For the first time since the Vietnam war, Washington this year sent its own regular troops into action against the developing countries, and not just the troops of its satellites as was the case over the past 10 years. That naturally increases the danger which the U.S. global strategy entails, but at the same time it also clearly shows where it is aimed -- at establishing the United States's world domination, which in Washington jargon is called leadership. This linguistic camouflage does not, of course, alter Washington's intentions.

[Andrianov] These intentions are not altered, either, by the fact that various pretexts are devised in the attempt to carry them out -- from the sham desire to promote peace and stability in some particular region to the notorious, selfsame Soviet threat.

[Volskiy] And this is being used as the basis -- if that is the right word -- for constructing whole concepts for the future. For instance, Casey, the CIA director, puts it like this: For a lengthy period of time the less developed countries will be the principal field of battle between the United States and the Soviet Union. This is a very dangerous concept because it places any local conflict -- and they, as you know, are numerous in the developing world -- it places any such local conflict on the plane of confrontation between Washington and the Soviet Union and the forces of socialism in general. This is already quite clearly discernible in the Near East -- the most dangerous of trouble spots. It's not just that the United States is now directly interfering in the military action there with their own troops and Navy, no, that is not all -- at the end of the departing year Washington put an official seal on its strategic alliance with Israel. This puts one very much on one's guard, especially when one takes into account that the United States makes no secret of its desire to turn the Near East into a bridgehead against the socialist community, just like the Far East, one might add.

[Andrianov] Suffice it to recall the accelerated militarization of South Korea and the official proclamation of the turning of Japan into the United States' unsinkable aircraft carrier.

[Volskiy] And it would seem, Boris Vasilyevich, that the militaristic preparations of the United States in the Far East are linked with similar preparations in the Indian Ocean basin. The U.S. 7th Fleet -- previously, its operations were confined to the Pacific. Today, it operates in the Indian Ocean too. It permanently maintains at least one naval flotilla, led by an aircraft carrier, there, and, what is more, it is now on practically continuous duty, so to speak, at the entrance to the Persian Gulf, that hot oil region. And let us not foget that the war between Iran and Iraq has been continuing there for several years now -- an internecine war which Washington is preparing to use, at the appropriate time, for its own military intervention.

The mechanism for such an intervention in the Persian Gulf was set up this year -- I have in mind the U.S. Central Command, the so-called Centcom, which comprises both the Rapid Deployment Force, and the large base on Diego Garcia, where, according to press reports, nuclear weapons are kept. Centcom's sphere of action even formally embraces 20 independent countries in the Indian Ocean basin, all the way from Kenya to Afghanistan. And leaving the formal state of affairs aside, in practice its actions are closely coordinated with NATO strategy. THE NEW YORK TIMES reported on Wednesday that there is a plan to set up a joint command within NATO for the Multinational Forces stationed in Lebanon, and it is clear why -- to tie more firmly the United States allies -- in this case, the Italian, French and British troops in the Multinational Forces together with the U.S. Marines -- to involve them more closely in the aggressive U.S. strategy in this region.

[Andrianov] Yes, the events of the departing year show vividly that two strategies, two courses, are in conflict in the international arena. The United States' ruling circles continue to pursue their ends: Under the cover of demagogy and making a show of its love of peace, Washington steps up its aggressive course. And the Soviet Union and our whole socialist community consistently and resolutely works to implement the peace program. You will recall that at the beginning of the year, in early January, the Warsaw Pact states adopted their Political Declaration in Prague. In it, they set out with the utmost precision and clarity their proposals for ways and means to strengthen peace and preserve and deepen the relaxation of international tension, declaring their readiness for dialogue and cooperation with all who strive to achieve this great goal. That position was later reaffirmed in June at the meeting of party and state leaders of the socialist countries in Moscow.

Soviet 'Peaceful Initiatives'

About 3 months ago, on 28 September, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov made a statement which set out initiatives directly aimed at securing a real balance of forces in Europe at the lowest level. Moreover, the proposals which were made did not make the slightest inroads on the West's security interests. Our peaceful initiatives, however, did not meet with due understanding on the U.S. side, and it is clear why: Washington was possessed by one concern--to deploy as quickly as possible its first-strike missiles in Europe in order to alter the military-strategic equilibrium on our continent in its favor and deliberately to condemn its own allies to the role of the hostages of Reagan's crazy nuclear strategy. Now, as you well know, the Pershing and cruise missiles are already being mounted on their launch pads. Thus, an open challenge has been thrown down to our whole socialist community. A direct threat to the security of the Soviet Union and our allies in the fraternal countries is being created. A fundamentally new situation has arisen in Europe. It dictates measures of a defensive nature -- which our community is taking by way of a fully justified response to the threat which has arisen. It is highly noteworthy that our country and our allies have announced quite openly the countermeasures they are adopting to preserve the balance of forces, and no more. This was especially stressed in Comrade Andropov's statement of 24 November in which he indicated that the Soviet Union did not strive for military superiority, and that we would do merely that which was quite necessary to ensure that the military equilibrium was not upset. It is quite clear that what is involved is the maintenance of a situation which has kept the peace in Europe for almost four decades. And let no one who is capable of taking an objective view of things have even a shadow of a doubt about the sincerity of our intentions. As Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov noted in his statement, the Soviet Union quite categorically and firmly declares that it remains committed to the principled policy of halting the arms race, and above all the nuclear arms race, and the reduction and, in the final analysis, the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

There is no question that the Soviet Union will continue to keep faith with the policy of halting the nuclear arms race, and this serves as reliable support for the forces struggling for peace throughout the world.

Nonaligned Movement Hailed

[Nekrasov] In this connection I would like to note that under present conditions it is impossible to achieve the preservation and consolidation of peace other than by uniting the efforts of all peace-loving forces, all peace-loving governments, political parties, public organizations and movements -- in short, all those who hold dear the future of mankind. And in this connection the successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting of representatives of states participating in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is noteworthy against the background of other international events of the year. The fact is that this meeting, despite all the attempts by Washington and its NATO allies to torpedo it or to impose upon it decisions which were deliberately unacceptable for the cause of peace, has shown that the aggressive circles of imperialism have not managed to cross out the process of the relaxation of international tension, to strike it through, as they say. No. On the contrary, Madrid confirmed the Helsinki line. It did not simply confirm the vitality of the idea of peaceful coexistence, it gave an impetus to the movement forward of the all-European process, and, as you remember, this found expression in the general agreement to convene a conference on measures to strengthen confidence and security and disarmament in Europe in January in Stockholm. Thus the Madrid meeting has shown clearly that despite the whole tension of the current situation, and notwithstanding the line of the aggressive imperialist forces, states with different social systems can come to mutually acceptable accords which are for the benefit of all peoples and for the good of the strengthening of peace.

When we speak about the forces on our planet that lead the struggle against the threat of nuclear war and for the peace and security of the peoples, we cannot, of course, leave out the Nonaligned Movement, for it includes about 100 countries, and what's more the population of these countries makes up about one-third of mankind.

[Andrianov] And the more so in view of the fact that the role of this movement in the world is growing all the time. And this is particularly important under present international conditions which are extremely complicated. Why? Well the imperialists even today have not given up their attempts to impose upon those taking part in this movement a concept, the meaning of which amounts to the following: that nonalignment ought, supposedly, to mean neutrality in the struggle between the forces of reaction and progress, between the liberation movement and colonialism; and that in general the nonaligned countries should select their fate in accordance with Western ideas. That is to say -- to put it more simply -- that on global international problems supposedly they ought to take up a position convenient for the United States, Britain, and the other leading countries of the West. However, this sort of concept on the part of the imperialists is rejected by the overwhelming majority of participants in the Nonaligned Movement.

This was confirmed clearly and convincingly by the seventh conference of heads of states and of governments of nonaligned countries. As you know, this took place in Delhi in March of this year. The forum in the Indian capital showed that the Nonaligned Movement, by virtue of objective reasons, does not stand and cannot stand aloof in the international arena, that its positions are inevitably close with the positions of other current freedom-loving and peace-loving forces in the struggle against the criminal actions and plans of imperialism.

More than this, both the work itself of the conference and the decisions taken in Delhi demonstrated the increased political maturity of the majority of nonaligned countries. And in this connection it ought to be noted that a central place in the decisions of the conference was given over to questions concerning the struggle against the nuclear threat. The Nonaligned Movement demanded, among other things, an immediate ban on the testing, deployment, use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons by all nuclear powers, and a freeze of arsenals of these weapons. At the same time it once again expressed itself firmly in favor of turning back the arms race and of universal and complete disarmament. It is characteristic that in speaking at the conference a whole range of delegates firmly supported the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, and also the proposals adopted at the Prague conference of the political-consultative committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states which are aimed at curbing the arms race and at the relaxation of tension.

[Volskiy] Boris Vasiliyevich, I think that here one ought to note particularly the fact that the attitudes of the Delhi conference in this field have once again turned out to be consonant with the peace-loving policy and the concrete proposals of our country and the socialist community.

[Andrianov] Indeed, this is once again clear evidence of the fact that the international interests of the socialist and the nonaligned countries coincide objectively or that they are very close to each other. But the aggressive policy of the United States and NATO did not meet with either understanding or support at the Delhi conference. Those taking part in the forum condemned the dangerous attempts to achieve military superiority in the world and the militarist theories and doctrines of limited nuclear war which have been declared by Washington. As Indira Gandhi stated, the Nonaligned Movement is now frequently called the major movement in defense of peace in history. And indeed at the present stage the Nonaligned Movement's link -- which is gaining increasingly in strength -- with the world anti-war movement has become one of its characteristic features. Furthermore, the nonaligned countries and the socialist countries are cooperating in international affairs aimed at curbing the aggressive imperialist actions and plans.

[Nekrasov] This circumstance particularly gives rise to irritation in Washington, and of such a spiteful kind that President Reagan himself made slanderous attacks upon the Nonaligned Movement during his address from the platform of the 38th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

[Andrianov] Yes, he decided to run down this movement, stating that it supposedly supported the governments of countries which were the satellites of the Soviet Union. But this impudent move by the master of the White House encountered widespread indignation on the part of all progressive forces in the world. As the Indian newspaper NATIONAL HERALD wrote, Reagan's peevish attacks on the Nonaligned Movement will undoubtedly earn him the contempt of all peace-loving people. A deserved rebuke for the insulting insinuations of the U.S. President was given by Indira Gandhi, prime minister of India and chairman of the Nonaligned Movement.

[Volskiy] It isn't the first time that Mr Reagan has resorted to spiteful calumnies of this kind. Long ago they became an everyday thing as far as he is concerned. And he is resorting to them because he sees how the forces of peace which oppose U.S. imperialism's aggressive plots are growing and multiplying.

[Andrianov] Quite indicative in this connection are the results of the work of the 38th session of the UN General Assembly.

And the main result of this forum lies in the fact that despite the whole complexity of the international situation, despite the stepping up of the activity of forces of militarism and reaction, despite the unbridled arms race, which they are building up, the majority of states are coming out in favor of strengthening peace, of continuing the development of detente, and against thermonuclear disaster. And it is essential to stress that this main result has been achieved thanks to the consistent and principled course of our party and state aimed at strengthening peace throughout the world.

Reports coming in from New York have pointed out what a great impression has been produced upon the General Assembly delegates by the statement by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov that the Soviet Union is convinced that peace can be strengthened and that the security of the peoples can be guaranteed not by means of building up and inventing ever newer kinds of armaments, but on the contrary by means of reducing existing armaments to immeasurably lower levels. Doubtlessly a decisive role in ensuring the fruitful work of the assembly has been played by the important new initiatives of the Soviet Union which are aimed at reducing the military danger, and at curbing the race in nuclear-missile armaments. Those taking part in this international forum supported by an absolute majority of votes the new Soviet proposal that was included in the session's agenda, the condemnation of nuclear war. Upon a proposal by our country, the assembly approved a resolution on a freeze of nuclear weapons. And the assembly supported a number of other initiatives by the Soviet Union, too.

Of course, it would not be correct to assert that the work of the session flowed smoothly and without a sharp struggle. Certainly not. The imperialist forces spared no efforts to undermine the assembly's authority by hook or by crook and to justify their course towards the aggravation of the international situation. With this purpose the United States and its allies made coarse attacks upon the policy of detente and the Soviet Union's important peace initiatives. However, as a result, they found themselves essentially to be in isolation. And here the fact is that during the discussion of many issues the front of solidarity of the socialist and nonaligned countries which oppose the aggressive forces of imperialism was operative. The advantage turned out to be on the side of the overwhelming majority of states which have displayed resolve to continue to do everything to remove the threat of war and to preserve peace for the present and rising generations. Undoubtedly this inspires not merely hope but the firm conviction that the struggle for this noble and right cause, which corresponds to the aspirations of the whole of mankind, will be successful in its outcome. At this point we take our leave of you, our respected radio-listeners. We thank you for your attention. All those taking part in our discussion wish you, dear comrades, all the very best in the new year which is about to start. Goodbye.

'STUDIO 9' ON U.S. POLICY, INF COUNTERMEASURES

LD242330 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0832 GMT 24 Dec 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio, with Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, chief of a sector of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] [Zorin] On the world political arena of late some extremely important events have occurred, so important that many analysts are speaking of the emergence of a new situation -- and a rather serious one at that -- in the world political arena. I should like to begin our discussion today by asking you, Vadim Valentinovich, a question -- in fact two questions: Can one really speak of a new situation, and if one can, then what is the essence of this new situation?

[Zagladin] I think that not only can one speak of a new situation, but one must speak of it. It really is there, but let's try and have a look at what it consists of. First, I should like to begin by recalling that on 8 June 1982 President Ronald Reagan said in the British Parliament that he wanted to mount a crusade against socialism. Later, when in various conversations with our foreign colleagues we mentioned this, they said: Oh forget about it, that's rhetoric, it's rubbish, it's just words, so to speak, it really means something quite different.

But they were not just words; it was not rhetoric at all. It is a very clear-cut description of the essence of the political course which the administration is now pursuing. The administration's aim is clear, we have spoken about it repeatedly: It is to halt the progress of history, to put back social development, to thrust back socialism or liquidate it altogether, and to halt the advance of progressive liberation movements throughout the world.

And in the past few months, this first feature of the new situation is that this crusade has begun to acquire, if it has not already acquired, quite evident material forms. On the one hand, these are such actions of the United States' foreign policy as interference, direct U.S. interference, in military operations in Lebanon, where it can be said that the United States is trying by force of arms to solve the problems which exist there, by the force of its own arms, and to solve them, of course, as it would itself like to do, attacking the national patriotic forces and the Palestine resistance movement.

Further, it is the events on Grenada, which are especially striking, because the grounds were invented here -- the invasion of Grenada was mounted under the pretext of giving aid to U.S. students who were there, but the students themselves said later on, appearing on television, that this was utter nonsense and they were not threatened by anything. The pretext was one thing, but the reality was quite different: to liquidate the system, the social order which had been established in Grenada by its people.

Further, one must include here the undeclared war against Nicaragua, the United States' support for the actions of the Republic of South Africa against progressive regimes in southern Africa, and so on. And finally, the last, chronologically speaking, and very important, the most important and most dangerous step: This is the siting of the new U.S. missiles in Europe. As Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov very accurately said, this siting is nothing but an attempt to place a concrete nuclear missile base beneath the adventurist policy which is characterized as a crusade. And so the materialisation of the crusade is the first feature of the new situation.

The second feature: The United States is drawing its allies into the wake of this course. It has forced -- well, true, forced is not quite the right word because the Governments of the FRG, Britain and Italy which agreed to site the missiles on their soil do bear much responsibility for this and they could perfectly well not have done so -- they unfortunately sited the missiles on their soil and thus tied themselves even more to the U.S. course and embarked on a limitation of their sovereignty, because the buttons of these missiles will be pressed by U.S. hands in the case of need, and not by anyone else.

That is one side to the case. The second side of the case, President Reagan's recent trip to the Far East showed that there, too, it is a question of rallying the allies, so to speak, on the basis of this crusade: An attempt was made to create a kind of triangle, an eastern NATO in the form of the United States, Japan and South Korea. There, between those countries, there are already bilateral treaties.

Now, some further formulation of this course is in progress. Therefore, one can draw the conclusion that the second feature consists of the fact that the United States wants to change the very character of the international relations which have taken shape in the recent past, to give these international relations a character, to create a situation in which a return to detente would be made as difficult as possible.

The third point: Washington is now saying a lot about the United States wanting to return to the talks and that they are virtually ready to sit down at the table tomorrow. Well, that may be so, only the question is, what talks are needed, what table do they wish to sit at? In the past we had many talks with the United States. There were talks on an anti-missile defense treaty, SALT I, SALT II, and the talks were not simple but they were real talks. It was a question of reaching agreement, at long last, through difficulties, but it was being reached. In Geneva two series of talks have now been held: On medium-range nuclear weapons and on strategic weapons. But they were not real talks because the United States did not set out to reach agreement there and did not strive for it. It did everything to anticipate, that is to say, to prepare the failure of the talks beforehand. And this in itself is a negative and dangerous thing, but still more dangerous is the phenomenon which is concealed behind this approach to the talks. It is quite evident that there it is a question of undermining the basic method of settling disputes which is the only one possible in our epoch, the method of talks. The United States is depriving this method of its concrete content. It should be said that this is also demonstrated by its attitude to the UN, to the decisions which the UN adopts -- this is the third feature of the new situation.

And the fourth and last -- it is not the last, of course, one can talk a lot but I want to restrict myself to the main things. The fourth point which I should like to pick out is the fact that the United States is everywhere wanting to rely on conservative regimes, to encourage these regimes. This applies to Britain, the FRG, Japan -- wherever this line is pursued. I repeat: I could of course continue, but clearly, what has been said is sufficient to come to the conclusion that the situation is really new, the situation is moreover dangerous, aggravated in comparison with what was before. We have long been asking ourselves and have been posing this question here, in our broadcasts: Is the world not at a bifurcation, at a parting of the ways which must be passed, and which will either lead to peace or else in a quite different direction?

Now we can ask a different question: Have we not already passed, have we not missed this bifurcation already? At any rate, this question is being asked in many organs of the press in the West, and in our country, in conversations with our people too, this question also is heard sometimes: Have we not passed this bifurcation, has the world not started rolling down the slope leading in a dangerous direction?

I personally do not think that this is the case, but at the same time it seems to be there is no doubt that the dangerous brink which exists in principle somewhere has now come closer to us.

[Zorin] Now I think we should focus our attention on this. Of course, there is no doubt that the negative processes occurring lately in the world have destabilized the international situation to a considerable extent, and it is quite natural that the attention of the international public and the Soviet people is drawn to these negative processes.

On other hand, one cannot fail to see that the situation is very complicated; it is not a simple situation. There are different elements in this situation and to draw a single negative denominator, if it can be put that way, under the current international situation would seem to be a simplification, a great simplification of the situation. In connection with this, I would like to continue our discussion by posing you the question, Vitaliy Ivanovich: What do you think? Has the course of events become conclusively defined or not?

[Kobysh] I do not think so. I think that everything is presently moving and developing, and although the trends that have appeared are very dangerous -- and we Europeans in particular and the people of Central America as well are forced to feel the reality of the threat. Nevertheless, this is not the end: Many things will happen here, and there are extremely great reserves, political reserves, political reserves and many others as well. I would put it this way: The struggle is expanding. Now we are Europeans and what is occurring on our continent disturbs us in particular.

Great efforts are being made in Washington and some NATO capitals to create the impression that the affair with the Pershing and cruise missiles is a problem that has been decided once and for all, and that is the end of it. But no, it is early to say that it is finished. Discussions about the missiles, and not only discussions, are far from over and regardless of how much publicity is given to the timetable for the deployment of these Pershings -- and the United States, you know, is constantly emphasizing that everything is going precisely according to a definite schedule -- there will be many things here and it can already be seen how the struggle against the missiles is unfolding, a struggle Washington and NATO simply did not expect, either in terms of its scale or its character.

Washington has already run into such explosive consequences stemming from this move that some of the serious people in the U.S. capital -- and they do exist there -- have, according to the formula: Feasted and made merry, taken stock and shed a tear. They have become very thoughtful now. Where can it all lead?

Now it seems to me that two factors are chiefly being taken into consideration. First, the military factor. The deployment of batteries has begun in the FRG, Britain, and Italy. The threat of nuclear war has increased, but it has also drawn closer to the United States itself.

The Soviet Union announced, and it is reinforcing this with practical measures, that our missiles near the coast of the United States will be located at exactly the same distance as the U.S. missiles that have appeared by the borders of the socialist community and their flight time will be absolutely the same, not a second more.

So what has the United States won in the military sense? This is not an idle question. As I see it, this question now disturbs sufficiently broad circles of the U.S. public, and the military, too, has given it some thought. As far as the public is concerned, you have probably seen the very interesting results of the U.S. public opinion poll made for TIME magazine. This most recent poll says that 67 percent of the Americans questioned consider that the main task at present is, and I quote: efforts to decrease the risk of a nuclear war. In other words, more than two-thirds of all Americans consider that the main problem now is to avoid a nuclear war. This is a serious business; this is very important.

It turns out that according to the perceptions of Americans, and it is a correct perception, the decision to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles turned out to be a boomerang that has struck the security of the United States.

[Zagladin] Vitaliy Ivanovich, please excuse me, but recently I had occasion to talk with representatives of university circles in the United States, fairly influential people, who expressed the following thought, that in my view, is a correct one. President Reagan is the first president in the history of the United States who has placed the security of the country under a real threat, who has created a real threat to the security of the United States, the risk of its being drawn into war with catastrophic consequences. This has never been the case in the past, although there have been different situations. And they say, these people I have spoken to, that this is increasngly being realized.

[Kobysh] Now the second thing that seems to me to be very substantial, stems from this story of the medium-range missiles. It is the political aspect of this problem. Here the cost that has been borne by Washington is simply incalculable. The main problem for the U.S. is the fact that the Europeans have seen that the United States is using their territory as a bridgehead, no more than that. And that they, the Europeans, are no more than hostages. And already this is now finding embodiment in very serious matters. No doubt Vadim Valentinovich is better able than I am to say what is now taking place with a party whose leadership participated in the decision on the deployment of the missiles, like the Social Democratic Party of Germany. As far as I understand it, it is now changing to a considerable extent and is becoming a serious force in the antiwar and the antinuclear movement. This cannot fail to disturb the United States.

More than this, the affair goes beyond the confines of Europe. For something shattering has taken place for Reagan, who only recently visited Japan, a visit which appeared to him to be triumphal: In the general election the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan, that is to say in effect the Nakasone government, one of the most conservative in the history of postwar Japan, suffered a crushing defeat. This is a dreadful blow to Washington, because many dispositions which had been built either collapsed or are collapsing. Thus the picture, you see, is far from simple and history is not so straightforward as one might have imagined.

[Zagladin] If one takes a broad look at the world, then on the other hand it is possible to see that there is another tendency alongside this dangerous one, and one that cannot be escaped. If there is a crusade, a whipping up of tension, then there is something else too -- the continuing and unrelenting activity of the forces which oppose the crusade. First of all I have to say this, that we can already see clearly that the initiative on the world arena still belongs not to the United States. Aggression is not an initiative on the international arena. An attack on Grenada or an invasion of Lebanon and so on are not initiatives in the international arena. An initiative in the international arena is the proposal of a concrete course leading into the future, which opens up the way to peace for mankind. This initiative continues to be in the hands not of the United States, but of the socialist countries, primarily our country, and of other states, including the nonaligned states. This also applies to them, to an enormous extent: That is to say, it is in the hands of the forces which oppose this crusade.

[Kobysh] And in connection with this what happened a few days ago at the United Nations is of course extremely interesting and important.

[Zagladin] Quite right.

[Kobysh] The voting on our initiatives, which turned into a triumph of the policy of detente and a defeat of the course toward confrontation ...

[Zagladin interrupts] Yes.

[Kobysh]... brought out a very great deal toward the end of this year.

[Zagladin] And particularly important is the fact that this concerns questions which are not secondary in character but which have the character of principles: That is to say, these are issues of condemning nuclear war, of freezing nuclear weapons, of nonuse of space for military purposes. That is to say, problems which do indeed concern the future of mankind and the prospects of war and peace.

Now for the second point which you have already mentioned, Vitaliy Ivanovich, but on which we might also expand, perhaps. This is the resistance to the missiles which is being noted and which we all increasingly see in Europe and in other countries of the world. This is not an individual case, either. It is a question of the fact that the policy of Reagan as a whole -- and not just the missiles -- that the policy of the present administration has brought into being a very deep conflict; and in principle this conflict has always existed somewhere there -- in concealed compartments, downstairs, in political cellars, so to speak, because the policy of imperialist forces is always, objectively, in contradiction with the interests of the popular masses, although this does not come out onto the surface in every case.

Present policy is one of those areas which are particularly disguised and particularly varnished in order to avoid any kind of open confrontation with the masses. But it is here that this very confrontation has taken place: Missiles in Europe, Grenada, Nicaragua -- everything together has given rise to open conflict between public opinion and government policy. And in the countries where the missiles have been deployed this conflict has grown into direct confrontation between the masses and the governments, and indeed it is the first time that it is taking place in this form and on such an important issue as that of war and peace.

And there is another circumstance in this connection: relations between the United States and its allies, between those countries and the United States, and between those countries where U.S. missiles are stationed and those countries where missiles are not stationed. Can one indeed say that the United States has managed to squeeze everyone in this way? Yes, it has, so to speak, managed to get the ruling circles of three countries to give their agreement to the missiles and to get Nakasone -- who suffered defeat as a result -- to agree to some joint U.S. military plans. But at the same time we see how the splits and the contradictions in relations between the United States and its partners are getting deeper. It is a question both of the usual ones and of unusual ones, too. Take the session of the European Economic Community in Brussels. It ended in complete failure. They did not agree on anything. They were not even able to prepare a proper communique. The trade, steel and credit war between the United States and Europe is continuing. It is also continuing between the United States and Japan. These are, so to speak, basically normal things. It's just the scale, maybe, that has become unusual. But I have something else in mind -- the contradictions on the approach to international relations, the contradictions on the approach to relations between East and West, i.e. between socialism and the nonsocialist countries.

The United States is imposing its course. But it is supported far from everywhere. On the contrary, in Europe and in other parts of the world there are an increasing number of people -- among the ruling circles, I mean, not just among the broad masses, so to speak -- who realize the course of confrontation will not solve any problems, who realize that the contradictions between the two systems -- the ideological, political and social contradictions -- cannot be solved by military confrontation. That path leads nowhere.

So, returning to the question which Valentin Sergeyevich posed at the beginning, although one can say that the situation has been exacerbated, one cannot say that Washington's policy, which has caused the world real damage, has triumphed. To say that would be absolutely wrong. One is not speaking of an exacerbations of the struggle between those who advocate peace, life and a future for mankind, and those who are trying to undermine peace, the foundations of future life and the prospects for the development of society.

[Kobysh] Every cloud has a silver lining, as they say. This situation of exacerbation, upon which a great deal of light has been shed, has after all now shown some other aspects of the world which stand opposite us, aspects of its life. What is the upshot? You just said that the missiles have certainly not been accepted unanimously. They have not only not been accepted unanimously, even by ruling circles. All the statistics, so to speak, show that they have not been accepted, statistics which are well known in Washington and everywhere else. Three-quarters of the population of West Germany are actively, absolutely, definitely, and unequivocally opposed to the missiles. But the Government of West Germany accepts the missiles.

This raises a question about bourgeois democracy, a question about what kind of society this is which calls itself democratic but does not heed the wishes of the people over such a fundamental question as the question of war and peace.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, what if one were to take a look at the other aspect of what you said. As you said, there is of course no question of a defeat for the progressive forces and the democratic movements. But some analysts are now describing Washington's so-called victory as a Pyrrhic victory. They have in mind the ancient King Pyrrhus who, in winning victory, sustained such losses which led to his destruction and the collapse of all his endeavors. Do you consider this description of what the Americans have accomplished, as a Pyrrhic victory, to be correct or not?

[Zagladin] To a certain extent it is right of course, because the cost of this so-called victory is very great. For this reason it is even difficult to speak of a victory really. Vitaliy Ivanovich has already spoken about this. On the other hand, this may also be a somehwat premature judgement because the consequences of the decisions being taken by the administration, of the course which it is following, have not yet had their full effect. And there is the following interesting thing. It was thought that with the deployment of the missiles the anti-war movement, which has become particularly powerful in Europe, would subside, would end, would expire so to speak. But that is not happening. On the contrary, the struggle is assuming new forms. It is becoming more radical. It is becoming more aware, more purposeful.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, I want to ask you to dwell on this question, because this is clearly one of the most important features of the present situation.

[Zagladin] Yes, but first I will finish making my point.

[Zorin] Yes.

[Zagladin] The point is, you see, that this shows that not all the consequences have shown themselves yet. The struggle has not ended. The anti-war movement has not exhausted itself. It continues to develop. This in fact shows that one cannot yet say that all the negative consequences for Washington of its policy are already apparent. There will be other consequences which will be no less negative than those which we see today.

But now, since we have gotten onto the subject of the antiwar movement, I want to say the following. One sometimes hears the view or opinion expressed that this movement is a kind of temporary or ephemeral phenonemon, so to speak, that it was brought into being by some definite threats, the missiles for example, or some other threats, that it will inevitably go out of existence subsequently. There is another point of view, that this is the result of a communist conspiracy or something of that kind. That is the position of the U.S. Administration. But neither point of view is correct. Above all it seems to me that the emergence of the contemporary anti-war movement is an absolutely logical thing.

Why is it logical? Imperialism has now reached a stage, the one which we see today, in which militarism, the preparation of wars, the waging of wars, which so far have been small and local ones, and the militarization of internal life in the Western countries have become an everyday phenonemon, have become the most graphic manifestation of the essential nature of contemporary imperialism. In these circumstances it is quite obvious that such a manifestation of such an essential nature could fail to bring about a rebuff. It could not fail to give rise to a public reaction. The anti-war movement is the reaction to certain specific acts. In other words it is the response, of course, to specific acts. These acts are the reason why it is developing particularly strongly. But, basically, it is the reaction to the very essence of the policy of imperialism, to its militaristic basis. And I do not think that as long as this basis exists and there is no reason to say that it will be abandoned soon. This movement will exist in one form or the other. There will of course be various stages in its development, ups and downs. A certain contradictoriness and inconsistency have of course been and remain inherent in this movement. That is only natural. In the final analysis this movement is in many respects a diverse one. And not just in many respects. It's not simply a question of social diversity. It is not enough to say that it is a diverse movement. It is a movement which embraces all sections of contemporary society, ranging from certain representatives of monopoly capital to the working class. Social diversity inevitably leads to certain contradictions in the development of this or that social movement, to certain complexities and zig-zags in its development.

Sometimes a parallel is drawn between the contemporary anti-war movement and the peace movement which existed in the '50s. This is logical because the present movement does indeed continue -- to a certain extent -- the traditions of the earlier movement. But it is at the same time a completely new thing. It is a new phenomenon. The present movement combines emotion, commonsense, and awareness of the threat of war, which has become particularly prevalent of late, in view, particularly, of the positions which have been taken by scientists and doctors, who have been explaining the danger of the situation to the peoples. It combines this awareness of the threat of war with a constructive search for ways to struggle against the threat of war. In the 50s the movement was to a considerable extent an emotional one and concentrated on very general slogans -- very correct ones but nevertheless very general ones.

But today's participants in the anti-war movement have a profound understanding of the essential nature of the foreign policy and the military policy of imperialism. Furthermore this is no longer a movement of the masses alone, a movement made up of representatives of, say, the most aware section of the masses, the intelligentsia or the most aware section of the working class, and so on. No, this is a movement in which both the masses and its organizations are participating. Political parties are involved in this movement as parties.

Vitaliy Ivanovich asked -- or rather spoke of, mentioned, the evolution of the German Social Democratic Party. The party has indeed evolved. The party now takes an anti-missile stand, and an anti-war stand.

[Zorin] That selfsame party which played a large role in NATO's notorious two-track decision.

[Zagladin] Actually it was more Chancellor Schmidt. But he was supported by the party, of course, during that period. But now this party and its chairman Willy Brandt, whom we respect, are putting forward specific programs of struggle for the strengthening of peace, for the surmounting of the danger of war. These plans are not our plans. They differ in some ways from our approach. But, generally speaking, these programs are very close, as it happens, to our approach. Or take other social democratic parties. The Flemish Socialist Party in Belgium has put forward a program, consisting of several points, which, generally speaking, in my view, can be used as one of the instruments of the struggle for security in Europe. The Socialist International, as a whole, is passing resolutions which could well be a platform for joint struggle by a very wide variety of political forces. In addition to parties, trade unions and church organizations are taking part in this movement. In other words it is made up of a highly diverse range of, I stress, organizations.

What is important is that the anti-war movement was born as an expression of the will and the mood of the people, of the masses, as a reflection of the conflict between ruling circles and the public about which we have already spoken. But now it has itself become a factor acting on and influencing the mood of the masses, the mood of the public, a factor in inculcating an anti-war consciousness in the broadest strata of the people. And here I have to agree completely with Vitaliy Ivanovich, in the sense that of course, this movement is a manifestation of the masses' aspiration for democracy. Vladimir Ilich Lenin once said that the biggest manifestation of democracy is in the issue of war and peace; and here we have in mind this biggest manifestation of democracy, when such masses, such a majority are coming out in favor of peace, that is is beyond comparison with anything -- in comparison with the past, in comparison with all the other manifestations of the masses. Nevertheless, the ruling circles are not paying heed to this. The matter is, if you like, one of a political crisis, one which has come to a head or which is just beginning, and including a crisis in the military policy of those countries where the will of the masses has come into such acute confrontation with the line of the ruling circles.

[Kobysh] Interesting processes are going on in the United States of America. As you and your listeners and viewers probably know, a fashion has emerged there for construction of personal private bunkers, intended to let one sit things out in the event of nuclear war. It was not very clear what they were reckoning on. but there was such a fashion, it swept the United States, and thousands of these bunkers were built, a simple incalculable number of them. Many of those who sat it out, or tried, or rather, hoped to sit it out in the bunkers, and engaged in construction of these personal bunkers, are now joining the anti-war movement.

Moreover, something altogether striking is happening -- there are already many instances in which I would say it has even become normal, that on retirement from public service, civil servants, and even many leaders of the Pentagon and the CIA -- and they know the situation and the extent of the danger better than others -- are also becoming active participants in the movement for a nuclear weapons freeze. That is the U.S. reality.

[Zorin] Well, since you have touched on the peace supporters' movement in the United States, I would like to say that it really is unusual in scale for that country. Last year I had occasion to see a million-strong antiwar demonstration in New York; there has not been anything of that scale in the United States since the war. This is an important political factor. On the other hand, in order to be realistic, in order not to mistake what is desirable for what is real, it must be stated that it is, all the same, difficult to compare the scope of the antiwar movement in the United States with the scope of the antiwar movement, let's say, in Western Europe, or Japan. This can be explained by a whole range of circumstances which are specific to the United States; for example, the influence of the middle strata, the fairly numerous middle and petit bourgeoisie in that country are especially fond of picking up all kinds of chauvinistic slogans, and the current administration is playing extremely artfully on its frame of mind, using the most inexcusable demagogy, and this is weakening the movement. And one has to say something about what Gunnar Myrdal, a very experienced politologist, a clever man and famous Swedish scientist, once spoke of: He wrote that a considerable danger, both for the United States itself and for the rest of mankind, is represented by the fact that Americans, Americans as a people, have no immediate memory of the horrors of war, which there is in Europe and in Japan. Americans know war from books and movies. They try to imagine it, but, putting it crudely, Americans have not experienced a big war on their own backs. That does not mean that we want them to experience this, but, as a real factor of the present day, it is a factor, and it is a fact that every year more people die on U.S. roads as a result of car accidents than the United States lost during World War II. And this has its effect on the country's mood, and has its effect on the fact that the antiwar movement in the United States has up to now lagged behind what is happening in other countries of the world, although one must look at things objectively. This movement is, on a U.S. scale, already a big one, and continues to grow quickly.

In connection with what I am talking about, a question arises, and I would like to put it to you colleagues: There is, of course, no doubt that regardless of its professional level, whether it has greater or lesser professionalism, let us say that the Reagan leadership realizes what nuclear war is. It understands that it is such a catastrophic disaster that there can be no question of a U.S. victory in nuclear war, that it is a tragedy for all, including the United States.

[Zagladin] (?Valentin Sergeyevich), I would not agree with you, because there are different people; there are those who are creating whole doctrines about the possibility of victory, and who put it on a completely fantastic, unrealistic, stupid basis, but still on some basis. You probably know about that report on the consequences of war for U.S. agriculture?

[Kobysh] Yes.

[Zagladin] Well, excuse me, but it's nonsense, that is, in truth, it is a monstrous thing. It begins by indicating that there will be nothing terrible, because, firstly, cows suffer less from nuclear radiation than people, and secondly and mainly, there will be fewer so it will be easier to feed them. So nothing terrible will happen.

[Kobysh] But that is pure propaganda, Vadim Valentinovich.

[Zagladin] Of course, but it is propaganda aimed at something.

[Zorin] But somewhere between themselves, I am thinking that somewhere among themselves, when they gather in closed company, for instance when they are watching that film "The Day After"... [interrupted]

[Zagladin] Then they have to understand, of course.

[Zorin] They understand. And here the question arises, if they realize -- and we shall in any case accept the premise that for themselves and among themselves, not for external use but for themselves and among themselves, the U.S. leaders can imagine all the horror of a thermonuclear catastrophe -- then how can one explain the course of moving toward the verge of the abyss which the current administration is following?

[Kobysh] It seems to me that in general the whole philosophy of life of this capitalist, imperialist country is the background of this course. It cannot be understood if you do not know the United States. We know the stock market, we know how the game goes on at the stock market. Well, the methods of the game on the stock market are now being transferred to international relations. That is, it is a stake on blackmail. It is, you know, a kind of nuclear poker. Of course be it as it may that not all today's U.S. leaders have a systematic education, there are serious gaps in it, and that they often assess the real facts from positions of political ignorance, of course they understand that unleashing nuclear war means suicide. But they have become very much used to acting high-handedly. This is in general, as Lenin said in his time, a characteristic of U.S. imperialism. They think they will overtake the Soviet Union in some or other weapons system, gain superiority, or that they might get one thing by haggling and seize another by crude force. It is clear that this is, simply, lacking seriousness, its not serious. We have never imposed a single new weapons system, but it remains a fact that neither have we ever cede ground in any weapons system. And as for intimidating anybody with nuclear war, what Vadim Valentinovich was speaking about, that simply laughable, to so speak, report about nuclear war in relation to U.S. agriculture, it is simply ridiculous. It is so flagrantly ridiculous that it would seem that in Washington and NATO staffs they are beginning to understand this more than before.

And so I begin to wonder here, although this might be grounds for dispute -- is this not the explanation why at the latest December NATO sessions in Brussels, plans for all-round stepping up of conventional weapons were announced? What are conventional weapons? It is a very relative thing [Veshch ochen uslovnaya]. They are now extremely dangerous weapons. These weapons are close to nuclear ones in their death-delivering force. But in itself this circumstance, this peddling, so to speak, of conventional weapons, nevertheless deserves attention in my opinion, the opinion of a civilian, just as attention is deserved by the fact that of late the military strategists from Washington and NATO, not by any means rejecting the policy of nuclear blackmail, are speaking more and more often not about global nuclear war, but about so-called minor wars, peripheral wars.

And so, to sum up, blackmail, first and foremost, is the basis of everything. And, to answer your question, Valentin Sergeyevich, I do think that, ultimately, they will come to the negotiating table. But they want to extract a higher price for this, as it were. After all, everything is for sale and purchase over there. They think that this, too, can be haggled over.

[Zagladin] I would like to dispute this a little, if I may.

[Zorin] Yes.

[Zagladin] It seems to me that we are indeed now seeing both persistently local or limited wars and discussion of conventional weapons. But does this mean that the organizers have become aware, so to speak? They knew about the danger of nuclear war before. And they know about it now, no worse and no better than before. I'm referring to those who knew. There are those who may accept this as an abstract concept. But it is something else which has happened, the thing which we were all discussing earlier on. That's to say, there has been this explosion of the anti-war movement, the explosion of anti-war feelings and the change in the position of ruling circles in many Western countries. And it seems to me that this talk is more a reaction to this than anything else. Why should they be discussing conventional weapons? Because nuclear weapons arouse such hostility, because they arouse such revulsion on the part of the masses and public forces. And it seems to me, at any rate, that this is one of the main reasons why they are talking about this.

But apart from that one should not forget that real military calculations are involved here. This is because nuclear weapons are destructive. To move forward, one needs conventional weapons. You cannot fly ahead on a nuclear bomb, and they intend to move forward to somewhere. In all the wars which they have waged up to now, they have tested -- used conventional weapons. And they have used these weapons to do what they wanted, in particular on Grenada. So, nuclear weapons have their purposes. It's just that purely military considerations, so to speak, dictate.

But that is only one side of the matter. In mentioning this second aspect, I am not indulging in polemics but simply adding a further point. I agree with this concept of blackmail. Of course, there are maniacs, who hate socialism, who may make up their minds to take a catastrophic view -- which may do in certain circumstances. But, generally speaking, I think that for the moment it is a question of blackmail, of applying greater force in order to oblige us to make concessions.

In my view there is another very important factor, a factor which they do not really conceal. One of the commissions of the House of Representatives recently published a report which clearly sets out the following ideas. The situation in the Soviet Union, and the other socialist countries, it says, is complex. They have their difficulties. We will use the arms race to increase these difficulties. We will exhaust them economically. Political problems will arise. Problems with the nationalities will arise. And this is what they are relying on, one of the things which they are relying on. This is also a form of blackmail. But this is not so much a form of blackmail as a form of pressure. Exhaust -- this word is even used sometimes in Washington's speeches and official statements. Well, one must state bluntly that this intention is not a new one, because if you look back, you can see that when Hitler attacked us, he also hoped that the Soviet Union would fall apart, that national contradictions and, generally speaking, anything else you care to mention would flare up.

But quite the reverse happened. The people who had been compressed like a spring, a spring which exploded and wiped fascism and its inspirers from the face of the earth, rallied. So this is not a new thing for us. If such things failed in the past, they are all the more doomed to defeat now, of course.

The measures to strengthen the defense capacity will not of course facilitate the fulfillment of some of our other plans. But at the same time our country and our allies along with us are sufficiently mighty for us to be able to go forwards carrying out both these tasks, both of them. At a time when both the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community are taking real steps to raise the effectiveness of production, to speed up the scientific and technical revolution, and to improve the organization of production and labor, our potential is increasing. The reports on the results, the preliminary results, of the first 10 months of the year in our country -- of the first 11 months in the other countries -- which have been published, show that these results are better than the results of last year, considerably better. This applies particularly to our country. This just shows that the measures being taken by our leadership are effective. If that is the case, then these hopes of exhausting us, of applying economic blackmail, economic pressure are all the more groundless, generally speaking. But we cannot, of course, ignore the fact that these hopes exist.

[Zorin] There is another aspect of the matter too. When they began implementing this plan for exhaustion, about which you have been speaking, Vadim Valentinovich, the people who thought it up in Washington reckoned that with its wealth the United States was capable of carrying out a policy of both guns and butter. But the course of events has shown that this was a very big miscalculation on the part of the Reagan administration. It is being said that Reagan's chances at next year's elections will depend to a great extent on economic factors, on the country's economic situation. But in spite of the fact that there is currently something of a revival in U.S. industry, economic problems have not eased. They have not eased because the gigantic national debt, which has reached absolutely fantastic proportions, lies heavily upon the U.S. economy. The United States has a national budget deficit without precedent in all its history. One of Reagan's main promises was to reduce the national debt. But he is now approaching the election campaign with an extraordinarily large national debt. Where does this debt come from? Where does the budget deficit come from? They derive from the fact that they have tried to exhaust others. In doing so they picked up an enormous stone, only to drop it on their own feet -- or so it seems.

[Zagladin] Yes.

[Zorin] This is a problem which now looks quite different from what it did when the plans for blackmail, including economic pressure on the Soviet Union, looked so straightforward on Washington's paper.

Well, since this is our last discussion in Studio 9 this year and we are all on the threshold of the approaching new year, 1984. We would like, in common with everybody else, to take a little look ahead and try to imagine what awaits the world, what awaits us in the forthcoming year, 1984. And at the end of our talk I would like to ask you to answer the question of what we are taking with us into this new year.

[Zagladin] This is, of course, a reasonable question in that we are indeed on the threshold of the new year. What can we expect? What can we hope for? These are the questions which we are all asking ourselves. That is natural. I think that the conclusion which can be drawn from all that we have all been saying is that the picture in the world today is indeed very complex and very contradictory. Nevertheless it seems to me that certain prospects, the general direction of events, if I may put it that way, are visible. In this respect one needs to say the following: Every day and every year are a kind of amalgamation, an amalgamation of the present, the past and the future. And today's date, on which we have gathered here, is also an amalgamation of the past, the present and the future. The past because, in the first place, everything we experience is the present-day legacy of the past and because, the lessons of this past oblige us, enable us, to ponder and enable us to look at where events may go from here.

As far as the past is concerned, we began our talk today with Reagan's crusade. I have already said that attempts of this kind have already been made. That is indeed so. I mentioned Hitler. But attempts of this kind were not just made by him. Going further back into history, one recalls that immediately after the October Revolution President Wilson called for the eradication of the poison of Bolshevism wherever it showed itself. And those were not just words, because the United States — the administration of the time -- sent its troops to Russia in order to eradicate this poison and to cauterize it, so to speak, on the map of the world. For 16 years they refused to recognize the Soviet Union. They still thought that it would disappear, that this anomaly of history, as President Reagan calls it now, would disappear. But the anomaly did not disappear at all. It turned out not to be an anomaly -- it turned out to be a mighty state which had to be recognized.

Later there were all sorts of other things. I won't give you all the details. But, after the Second World War, in which our countries were allies in the struggle against Hitler, a further attempt was made to roll us back somewhere. That is, incidentally, what they called it, the strategy of rolling back socialism.

And then, in 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 and later years the question again was not only of rhetoric, it was a question of specific plans for military attack, and even the deadlines had been appointed, for the military attack. But each time these deadlines were not met; they were not met because at the beginning they reckoned on nuclear monopoly, but the nuclear monopoly was destroyed when the Soviet Union in response created its own nuclear weapons. Then they reckoned on the inaccessibility of the United States. The weapons are there, they said, but how will you use them? The creation by our country of missile systems liquidated the myth of U.S. inaccessibility. Each time these plans had to be postponed and delayed to a more distant future. What was to be done? And then came the end of the 1960s, and the 1970s when it became clear to everyone, and to the United States too, that parity had been reached, military-strategic parity, and reasonable conclusions were drawn from this. President Nixon was able then to turn -- although he was certainly no champion of socialism nor did he somehow like our country -- yet he was able to make a turn and move to detente. Relations between our countries improved. Well, what did that mean? It meant that for the second time thrusting back had to be renounced.

Now we have the third such attempt. Yesterday shows that this is futile. And today? Does it say that these plans can succeed? No, it does not. Indeed, the balance of forces which exists on the world arena, and which once made detente necessary, continues to exist. It has not changed. Not from the viewpoint of the alignment of forces in the world. On the contrary, those who oppose, the countries which oppose the policy of aggression, the course of this crusade, they are becoming greater in number, and they are becoming more and more active. Several years ago no one could have expected that many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America would today occupy the positions which they occupy.

Further, from the point of view of military strategy the balance has not changed, and we will not permit it to be changed. In response to the measures which were taken by the United States in Europe, a reply is being made. Our response measures, our measures are designed to neutralize the consequences of the U.S. measures, not to permit a violation of the balance, to restore the strategic balance. And this will be so in any event. No creation of any new types of armaments will take us by surprise. Everything necessary will be done.

Can it be thought, finally, that at the level of international policy, so to speak, those who oppose war will lower their interest in these questions, will lower their initiative-filled policy or the level of their initiative? Of course this cannot be expected. On the contrary, everything so far today demonstrates that the opposite can be expected -- one can expect a growth in this initiative, some further steps toward strengthening peace and consolidating international security.

And finally, the future, and this future is a simple question because the question boils down to one thing: Will there be any or not? There must be. And in my opinion all that we have been saying endorses the idea that mankind has understood this. It has understood that now it is a question of a struggle not for any secondary questions but for a question of fundamental importance: Will it have any future history, or will this history be cut short somewhat? Mankind does not want it to be cut short. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said in his statement that reason must win, that reason is the force which is called upon to break the progression of events. It seems to me that the antiwar movement, the actions of the nonaligned movement, of many neutral countries, and other states show that mankind has not really lost its reason, that it is in possession of this reason, that reason is being converted into material force. From thoughts and speech all this is transferred to the sphere of practical action, to the sphere of practical, cohesive, parallel, common action but directed, in the final count, to one and the same aim. Mankind wants to have a future and it must have one.

Of course, in order for this future to be secured certain conditions are necessary. These conditions -- what are they? Above all, this is the need to have sufficient strength to bar the way to attempts to violate the military-strategic parity and to wear out socialism economically and bring political pressure on other peoples. We are not posing the question of superiority, we are posing the question of having sufficient strength for the defense of our gains. We want to defend our gains and nothing more. Our people well understand this and hence the approval of the measures to strengthen the defense capacity of the country which were adopted, the approval for the response measures adopted in reply to the actions of the United States and NATO. And it is not so much a question of approval or of support in words, it is again a question of actions, of work, of political activity, of labor activity. In practice, it works out this way: in our epoch the strength of the state is not only its armed forces, although it very much depends on the armed forces, of course. It is the whole country, it is its whole economy, group A and group B, the means of production and consumer goods and culture and ideology, the moral cohesiveness of the people -- all this is the strength of the state. And it is this strength that we are not strengthening all together, that our people are strengthening. The consciousness of that fact that the front of the struggle for peace, for the security of the peoples, runs through every work place, this consciousness has become habitual for Soviet people, and this is perhaps the main thing, that gives us all optimism.

Mankind has clashed throughout its history with many obstacles, with many complexities and difficulties and has overcome them, although there were problems and there were losses on the way. Now the difficulties are great and the problems are very grave, but one can be convinced that mankind will be able to solve these problems. Modern civilization has a sufficient store of endurance in the struggle against modern barbarity and it must be thought that it will use this store as is necessary. The backbone of peace, and in this sense the backbone of the future, is socialism, our country, our allies. And now at the threshold of the new year, 1984, we would all like to wish success to all our countries and above all our country, our people and the peoples of the countries of our allies to all those who struggle for peace throughout the world, to wish successes, successes in work, successes in the defense of peace, in upholding the freedom and independence of their countries. It is always desired that new year wishes should come true. Perhaps these new year wishes today, wishes which we are convinced will be heard at many ends of the earth, are the most important wishes. They must come true, and we are sure of this.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air has run out, and it remains for me to thank you for taking part in our conversation today and our television viewers for their attention and to wish each of you and all of us together a good new year till we meet again in Studio 9 next year. Thank you.

'INTERNATIONAL REVIEW' HAILS SOVIET 'PRESTIGE'

PM262023 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Text] At the End of the Year

There are very few days to go before the end of 1983. In political terms in the West the year is over today with the start of Christmas and the traditional vacation. The time has come to sum up the results.

The onward development of the socialist world continued during this unprecedentedly eventful year. Its economic might increased. The proper level of defense capability contained imperialism's aggressive aspirations. Mankind managed to preserve peace in a complex and dangerous international situation, primarily thanks to the socialist countries' efforts.

At the end of the year it can be seen particularly clearly how the international prestige of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State has increased. The USSR and the other fraternal countries are dealing a firm rebuff to imperialism's bellicose plans and actions and are resolutely standing guard over peace.

Extremely wide approval all over the planet has been evoked by the 24 November statement of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which says that the Soviet leadership, fulfilling the will of our people, will continue to do everything possible to avert the threat of war and preserve peace for present and future generations.

In the year now ending U.S. imperialism has made fierce attempts to change the correlation of forces in the world arena to its own advantage.

This has been manifested both in its increased aggressiveness, as shown by the events in Grenada and Lebanon, and in the unprecedented buildup of the arms race, culminating in the deployment of medium-range American missiles in West Europe. However, Washington failed to achieve its objectives. The United States is ending the year in unprecedented moral and political isolation in the world arena. Its course of preparing for war is condemned by all mankind.

Nor were the enemies of peace able to disarm the movement of peace-loving forces. It is gathering pace, expanding, and acting increasingly vigorously to reverse the arms race and secure a return to the situation that existed before the start of the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe.

The world's peoples have seen for themselves that it was through the fault of the United States that the Geneva talks on medium-range nuclear weapons were wrecked. The talks on the reduction of strategic armaments have been postponed indefinitely. For 10 years now the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe have been deadlocked. All this has happened because the United States and its allies have responded to the peace offensive of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community with a militarist counteroffensive.

All the socialist countries' peace proposals, including the offer contained in the Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration of 5 January this year to conclude a treaty wth the NATO countries on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace, were rejected. All the USSR's proposals at the Geneva talks were also rejected out of hand. The United States had just one aim -- to secure unilateral military superiority in order to dictate the will of the imperialist powers to the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. Through the fault of those powers 1983, which could have been "peace year" in Europe, has been transformed into "missile year."

What have the Western Powers gained from all this?
Have the new American missiles increased their security? You don't need to be a specialist in the sphere of nuclear strategy to answer that question in the negative.

Exulting at the fact that they have succeeded despite everything in embarking on the deployment of new American first-strike nuclear missile weapons in Europe, President Reagan and the other NATO ringleaders are declaring that the "Western alliance" is more united than ever. However, the reality is different. The recent "Atlantic week" in Brussels has shown that the unity in the Western alliance is extremely relative. Both NATO members -- Greece, Spain, and Denmark -- and countries politically close to the bloc are opposed to the buildup of nuclear missile weapons in West Europe that Washington has begun. But the main point is this: The "unity" on a militarist basis that has been achieved at "the top" is resolutely rejected by the overwhelming majority of the U.S. and West European population. This makes the position of the governments responsible for taking the fateful decision on missile deployment not only shaky in the long term but also ambiguous from the viewpoint of the proclaimed -- if only officially -- ideals of bourgeois democracy: "Ruling with the consent of the governed." This consent does not exist. The same goes for trust in the rulers. According to a recent public opinion poll carried out in the United States, so TIME magazine writes, "the public doubts Reagan's ability to maintain peace" despite his assurances to the contrary.

The British, FRG, and Italian public is passing the same verdict on its governments. Small wonder that in the days before the new year Washington and the other NATO capitals have been constantly making assurances of their "readiness" to "seek accords" with the Soviet Union and to take new steps toward peace. But can the verbal "olive branches" conceal the palisade of new missiles erected in Europe?

The official optimism of the United States, which aspires to the role of "world leader" with regard to support for Washington's actions from the world community is no more justified. Commenting on the results of the UN General Assembly session that has just ended, U.S. Permanent Representative J. Kirkpatrick claimed that "the U.S. position in the United Nations has improved" and that American policy on most of the questions discussed "was quite well reflected."

It is possible to agree with the last comment, but with one amendment. In the resolutions adopted by the United Nations the present administration's policy has indeed been duly reflected -- negatively. The contender for "world leader" has found itself completely isolated in votes on the most cardinal questions of war and peace. The voting on the draft resolutions "Freezing Nuclear Weapons," "Condemnation of Nuclear War," "Preventing an Arms Race in Outer Space," and "The Nonuse of Force in International Relations," which were submitted on the USSR's initiative, unambiguously showed the whole world what the United States and its allies advocate.

They are against a freeze on nuclear arsenals and for nuclear war and the "right" to deliver a first nuclear strike, for "star wars," and for the use of force in international relations. If anyone had any doubt as to where the threat to peace really comes from, no one now has any doubt on this score. It comes from the United States and those who are obediently tagging along behind its aggressive policy fraught with the danger of nuclear catastrophe. In all its history the United States has never achieved greater moral bankruptcy in the United Nations and in the eyes of the world public!

Yes, the peoples and peace-loving countries are now having to deal with the U.S. Administration that, in the description of NEWSWEEK magazine, is headed by a "zealous and uncompromising anticommunist who is ready to go for his gun without hestitation." The Pentagon has already demanded $305 billion for 1985, and Reagan has approved this request. Plans have been announced for deploying cruise missiles with conventional warheads -- everybody knows they can be easily replaced with nuclear warheads -- in 10 countries, including Turkey, Japan, Denmark, the FRG, Iceland, and Norway. On the eve of the new year the Reagan Administration has given the "go-ahead" for the production of almost 30,000 units of nuclear weapons in the coming decade. This is the biggest buildup in the U.S. nuclear aresenal in the last 30 years.

The increased complexity of the world situation compels Soviet people more than ever to heighten their vigilance and strengthen our socialist motherland's economic might and defense capability. Our allies and friends are doing the same. Clearly, it should not be hoped that the "uncompromising anticommunist" may become less zealous and less bellicose. However, imperialism has not been omnipotent for a long time now.

The Soviet Union, assessing the situation realistically, not belittling the threat of war but not viewing it as inevitable either, and knowing the might and potential of socialism in the modern world, is full of confidence that human reason will be able to stop the nuclear maniacs and save our planet from disaster. No one will be able to bury detente along with the peoples' hopes of peace and cooperation.

The Aggressor and His Accomplices

On 19 December the UN General Assembly adopted by a majority of votes a resolution on the Near East situation. This again condemns the aggression of Israel, whose policy and actions "show with the utmost clarity that it is not a peace-loving member state and that it is not fulfilling its commitments under the UN Charter." The resolution calls for a complete and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and censures "any military, political, economic, financial, and technical support for Isreal, which encourages Israel to commit acts of aggression." This is a direct condemnation not only of Israel but also of its patron -- the United States.

Recent events in the Near East have shown that the United States is no longer satisfied with the role of accessory and accomplice of Tel Aviv but is embarking on direct military-strategic cooperation with it with the aim of establishing imperialist domination in the region. Lebanon is confirmation of this. For several years now this tormented country has been struggling to preserve its integrity and independence under the conditions of practically constant aggression by Israel, and now the United States as well. The "peacekeeping forces" that Reagan sent to the country made a contribution to the fact that the military conflagration in Lebanon was fanned with new force. The new killings of peaceful residents in Lebanon are the handiwork of these "peacekeepers." The United States is now trying to complete what Israel failed to do in 1982 in its bloody operation hypocritically code-named "Peace for Galilee" -- physically annihilate the Palestinian movement and the Lebanese patriotic forces that are preventing the implementation of the American-Israeli plan for the partitioning of the country.

The opponents of a settlement in Lebanon are exploiting the internation and religious strife, and also the disagreements within the Palestinian resistance movement and the lack of unity among the Arab states. As is well known, the first stage of the talks on an internal settlement in Lebanon, which were held in Geneva, failed to produce specific results. A continuation of these talks is planned. But the United States and Israel are now doing everything possible to hold the talks on their own terms. There is also active interference in the internal conflict that has arisen in the PLO.

On the one hand the United States and Israel have played on the contradictions that have arisen in the PLO over methods of continued struggle for a just solution of the Palestinian problem. These contradictions have been artificially fanned, including by American and Zionist agents. The split in the Palestinian resistance movement, which has inscribed heroic pages in the history of the struggle against American-Israeli aggression, took the form of an armed conflict. This naturally played into the hands of the Palestinian people's enemies alone and helped only to weaken the common front of struggle against the aggressors. On the other hand Israel and the United States have made extensive use of their Armed Forces in Lebanon to physically annihilate Palestinians and Lebanese.

Taking cover behind demagogic statements of his "desire for peace" in this region, Reagan is trying to convince Americans of the "need for sacrifices" -- of which there have already been many among the U.S. Marines.

The bloody "peacekeeping" is justified by the assertion that the Near East, in Reagan's words, "is a powder keg and the place where the war that no one wants may begin." For all the justice of that remark, one cannot help noting that what is even more just is the generally accepted opinion that the way to put out a fire is not with a combustible mixture, as Washington is doing but with water.

The Washington administration, which is becoming involved in a new war in the Near East, clearly needs a tub of cold water for sobering-up purposes.

Defeat for the "Hawks"

The defeat of the ruling Japanese Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) in the recent early parliamentary elections continues to be one of the leading topics in the world press. Left-wing forces and advocates of a peaceful direction of development for the country have considerably improved their positions.

According to the description of the Japanese press, "The LDP's defeat has caused irritation" in the United States. Not only because Washington was planning to "resolve the problem of liberalizing the Japanese market" for American agricultural and other goods immediately after the elections. The LDP's defeat has boomeranged against Reagan himself. His recent visit to Japan and talks with Prime Minister Nakasone proved to be a "bad turn" for the latter -- the Japanese quite clearly perceived the prospect of their country being drawn into the orbit of the aggressive U.S. military blocs and the prospect of an increase in military spending and American economic diktat.

Nakasone's course of turning Japan into a "member of the Western alliance" met with no support among voters. They also condemned the arms race foisted on Japan by the United States, as shown, in particular, by the failure of National Defense Agency chief K. Tanikawa in the elections. Nor did the Japanese support the course of confrontation with the Soviet Union and the plans for creating a United States-Japan-South Korea "strategic triangle." In short, in the future there can be no question of any kind of "mandate" from the voters for the pursuit of the "Nakasone line."

The LDP leaders' attempts (they are to meet in the Diet Monday to decide who is to head the country's government, but all the indications are that Nakasone will keep the premiership) to ascribe their defeat to bad weather and other equally "persuasive" factors hold no water at all.

The reverberations of the Japanese elections in the Western world are very great. The defeat of the LDP is a serious warning to the politicians in West Europe who gave the "green light" for the deployment of the missiles. It is also a warning to the figures in the United States who believe that it is possible to disregard the peoples' will for peace and to continue thoughtlessly to increase the momentum of the arms race.

TASS ASSAILS U.S. 'OBSTRUCTIONIST APPROACH' AT UN

LD270945 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 27 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets reports:

U.S. activities at all international forums that were held within the U.N. framework in the outgoing year were boiled down to sabotage of multilateral efforts aimed at settlement of the most acute conflicts in the present-day world.

American diplomacy stubbornly tried to take solution of such problems out of U.N. control, to impose its own recipes, disregarding the will of other states. As is noted at the U.N. circles, such a course is objectively aimed at undermining the Charter of the United Nations and its prestige, at shattering the basic norms of international law.

A striking example of the obstructionist approach of the Reagan administration is its policy of blocking up the granting of independence to Namibia. An international conference in support of the Namibian people's struggle for independence, held in Paris in April this year, again solemnly reaffirmed their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence in accordance with the U.N. principles. But, contrary to these calls, in violation of the U.N. Security Council's resolutions, the United States this year, too, supported the Pretoria regime which seeks to preserve its colonial rule over Namibia.

Washington deliberately put forward the demand of "linkage" between Namibia's decolonisation and withdrawal of the Cuban military personnel from Angola in order to prevent liquidation of the impasse in the solution of the Namibian problem and, consequently, to prevent liquidation of the main source of instability in the south of Africa. The United States wants to resolve the Namibian problem by its own scenario, agreed upon with the fascist Government of the Republic of South Africa, said Sam Nujoma, president of the South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO).

It is exactly with this aim that Washington turned into a screen for its machinations "the Contact Group" of Western states which was allegedly formed for mediation in negotiations on granting independence to Namibia. France is known to have already refused to participate in that hypocritical game and withdrew from that "Contact Group".

Washington refused to participate in the second world conference on the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, which was held on the U.N. initiative in Geneva in August this year. American representatives did not attend the international conference against the racist alliance between the Republic of South Africa and Israel, which was held in Vienna in July.

American diplomacy exerted at the United Nations quite an effort to prevent the holding of the international conference on Palestine by decision of the U.N. General Assembly. When these attempts failed, the United States refused to send its delegation to the conference which was held in Geneva in August-September. Washington gave a hostile reception to the decisions that were elaborated at the conference, to the condemnation of "versions" of settlement running counter to the interests of the Palestinian people.

Washington conducted the policy of sabotage also at other international forums within the U.N. framework. The United States did not participate this year in the work linked with the implementation of the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea and continued boycotting the beginning of global negotiations on economic matters called upon to restructure the international relations in the sphere of trade and finances on a fair and equitable foundation.

In the long list of major international problems which are under discussion at the United Nations there is practically no problem to the solution of which Washington made a positive contribution.

U.S. Standing 'Weakening'

LD231118 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2003 GMT 22 Dec 83

["The Great Lie of Mrs Kirkpatrick" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Dec (TASS) -- TASS observer Vladimir Matyash writes:

U.S. permanent representative in the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, known for her closeness to President Reagan, asserted in an interview with THE NEW YORK TIMES a few days ago that "our position in the United Nations has improved." She even hypocritically expressed "satisfaction" with the results of the present session of the UN General Assembly at which, it should be noted here, the United States found itself totally isolated during the discussion of current key issues. Thus, out of 17 resolutions on disarmament voted on, Washington's representatives supported only one. They opposed the Soviet Union's important peace initiatives which met with wide approval in the United Nations -- the declarations condemning nuclear war, advocating a nuclear freeze and preventing the militarization of outer space. As is known, the Pentagon has allocated a large sum for these aims -- the astronomical figure of $50 billion.

Mrs Kirkpatrick is also deliberately closing her eyes to other numerous failures in U.S. diplomacy at the United Nations. It is well known that the General Assembly condemned by an absolute majority of votes the armed invasion of Grenada by the U.S. military, the expanding U.S. military presence in Lebanon, and the so-called "strategic alliance" between Washington and Tel Aviv aimed at ending the liberation struggle by the Arab people. The United Nations has angrily denounced aggressive acts by U.S. imperialism against revolutionary Nicaragua and other countries in Central America who do not want to submit to American diktat.

In these conditions, Mrs Kirkpatrick's propagandist eccentric speech, as she clearly acts with the knowledge of the White House, can mislead nobody.

Apparently the sharp weakening of the United States' positions at the United Nations has seriously troubled the Reagan administration, but in Washington's corridors of power they prefer to keep quiet about the real reasons for the growing isolation of the United States at the United Nations. However, they are well known. These are, first and foremost, the attempts of the White House to talk to this authoritative and representative international organization in the language of diktat, pressure and crude blackmail, to foist its will upon it, not taking into account the changes which have taken place in the world.

All of Washington's latest actions at the 38th session of the UN General Assembly have convincingly shown that the present administration is trying in all kinds of ways to prevent the United Nations from resolving such key problems of the present international situation as reducing the danger of war, averting the threat of nuclear war, and consolidating universal peace.

Nor can we ignore malicious attacks upon the international community by official American authorities and U.S. representatives at the United Nations. President Reagan has personally supported hostile attacks by U.S. representative at the United Nations Lichenstein, who proposed that the United Nations should "remove itself" from New York. He was joined by New York Mayor E. Koch, who also demanded nothing less than that the United Nations should "get out" of that city.

Koch's attacks served as a signal for the clearly inspired unruly speeches against the United Nations by the U.S. bourgeois press, controlled by monopolies which are dependent to a significant degree upon Zionist capital and pro-Israeli circles. THE NEW YORK POST particularly excelled itself in this area, declaring without proof that supposedly the majority of New Yorkers are against the community of nations.

What is it in the United Nations' activity that is not to the liking of those initiating this hostile campaign? Obviously, it is -- apart from condemnation of Israel -- criticism of the U.S. adventurist course toward an unrestrained arms race, and efforts by the world community to lower international tension and to liquidate racialism and apartheid in the south of Africa. The Washington authorities could call Zionists and their stooges, who are going too far, to order. However, the very same Jeane Kirkpatrick claimed publicly that the United Nations, allegedly, does not further but "harms the cause of peace."

Comment is superfluous, as the saying goes.

REAGAN LEADING CAMPAIGN TO LEAVE UNESCO

LD241341 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 24 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 24 TASS -- TASS correspondent I. Ignatyev reports:

The Reagan administration, which launched a malicious campaign of attacks and blackmail against the international community, threatens to terminate U.S. UNESCO membership. Referring to well-informed persons in Washington, the newspaper "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR" reports that the recommendation on withdrawal from UNESCO was made in the report which was submitted for consideration of the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz by his assistant secretary Gregory Newell. According to the newspaper, the demand is fully supported by the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick, who became scandalously known by slanderous attacks against the United Nations.

President Reagan leads the campaign of unbridled attacks against UNESCO. As is clear from his recent pronouncements, the head of the White House is obviously irritated by the fair demands of the majority of states -- members of that competent international organization to reconstruct the existing world information order and to put an end to the sway of Western press in developing countries. Official Washington does not like either UNESCO's condemnation of the U.S. criminal links with the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and also the aggressive policy of the American "strategic ally" -- Israel.

As is noted by the "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR", there are apprehensions that UNESCO is only the first target "on the black list" of U.N. specialised bodies from which the United States might withdraw. The Reagan administration obviously does not like that the United States lost "the decisive voice" in affairs of the international community. It is infuriated by the growth of the influence of young independent states, their refusal to dance to the American tune. Washington, as before, is trying to impose upon the United Nations its principles of inter-state relations and solutions of international problems which are contrary to the interests of the majority of countries of the world.

Such a stand of the Washington administration is giving rise to serious criticism on the part of many sober-minded politicians in the United States itself. In a "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR" interview Senator Charles Mathias, Republican, from the state of Maryland, emphasised that UNESCO was engaged in extensive and useful activities. According to Republican Congressman Jim Leach, on terminating membership of that international organisation, the United States will find itself in isolation in the sphere of culture.

More on Campaign Against UNESCO

LD262049 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] The American newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR reports Secretary of State George Shultz is studying the recommendation worked out by his staff as to his country's withdrawal from the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, UNESCO. Yuriy Soltan comments:

What has the UNESCO done to displease Washington; to displease it to such an extent that President Reagan himself spared neither time nor effort in promoting a campaign of abuse against it. The matter is simple enough: Most nations involved in this prestigious international body made no secret of their attitude to the policy pursued by the Reagan administration and condemned it for its ties with the racist South African regime, for complicity in Israel's aggression in the Middle Fast and for other unseemly acts, so Washington blacklisted the UNESCO.

I don't care whether we are right or not, said Ronald Reagan when he took office, I want us to be respected. And he set out to earn respect on the world scene by resorting to threats, sanction and the naked use of military force. Such is the style of Washington's foreign policy nowadays and it is applied to the UN too.

The Reagan administration is irritated by the fact that the United States has lost the say in the affairs of the world community. It is incensed by the growing influence of young, independent countries and by their unwillingness to comply with American orders. It is frightened by the magnetic force of peace proposals advanced at the UN by the socialist countries.

President Reagan, proclaiming his qommitment to peace at the latest session of the UN General Assembly, praised the UN for its role in maintaining world security, but as soon as the General Assembly denounced the United States for its barbarous attack on Grenada, for its provocative behavior in the Middle East and for its refusal to support the resolutions aimed at averting the nuclear war threat Washington changed heart. The demand (?that the) United States reduce its financial contribution to the UN, drive it out of New York and boycott it began to emanate from the White House and from the Congress. Administration officials showered the UN with abuse, with the President himself setting the fashion. He even went so far as to say that no decision taken by the UN can affect this appetite.

However, the scorn shown for the UN by the master of the White House is obviously a put on act because Mr Reagan realizes well enough that every General Assembly resolution expresses the opinion of dozens of nations and displays their attitude to world events. At the discussion of a number of issues, particularly those relating to the curtailment of the nuclear arms race and a stop to outside interference in the affairs of nations, at the latest session of the General Assembly the United States found itself in profound isolation. This testifies to the political and moral bankruptcy of the Reagan administration whose dangerous activity gives rise to justified anger and indignation among nations.

U.S. 'DANGEROUS MILITARY ADVENTURES' VIEWED

LD252248 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Dec 83

[From "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin; Aleksandr Druzhinin report]

[Excerpts] In the final days of December each year, Washington dresses itself up in preparation for meeting the new year. The New Year festivities in the U.S. capital are ruled by long-established traditions.

But life does not let one escape from thoughts about the past, present, and future for long. Summing up the results of 1983, U.S. observers do not display optimism. For the United States, 1983 was the year of dangerous military adventures and an unprecedented increase of the nuclear arms race. It was the year when aggressive U.S. policy was accompanied by unprecedented raging of the military psychosis which was fanned up by the Reagan administration. One can say that it is this war hysteria which determines the atmosphere in which the United States is meeting the new year.

Americans see wars every day on their television screens -- those which the United States is presently waging and those it schemes for the future. [video shows still shot of men at war, captioned as "The Crisis Game"] Who, then, is threatening the United States? The Russians of course, the Reagan propaganda asserts.

Recently, one of the leading U.S. television companies showed "Crisis Games," a dramatization of the beginning of a new world war. The unbridled imagination of the authors of the scenario takes viewers to Iran, where in spring 1985 there is a coup d'etat. The Americans support the Iranian military junta. But the Russians are not napping -- 20 Soviet divisions cross the Iranian border heading south toward the oil-producing areas of the Persian Gulf. Confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union becomes inevitable. A real threat of nuclear war arises.

Nonsense? Of course, but dangerous nonsense, since similar crazy ideas are constantly being drummed into Americans, making them believe in the mythical Soviet threat and the inevitability of a military clash.

Nuclear war will be a catastrophe for all mankind. This simple truth is understood well by certain U.S. political figures as well. They do not make up a majority in Congress, but they exist. Included among them is Senator Edward Kennedy, who, together with Senator Mark Hatfield and other members of Congress, is supporting an immediate end to the nuclear arms race. [video shows Kennedy in armchair being interviewed by Druzhinin]

[Begin Kennedy recording in English with superimposed Russian translation] Our position is clear. We are striving for conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on freezing production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons, with corresponding checks. Then our countries might be able to embark on serious reduction of their nuclear arsenals, and in the long term come to agreement on completely rejecting nuclear weapons. That should be the ultimate aim, in my view. Stepping up the arms race does not strengthen the security of peoples. In politics, we must base ourselves on these conclusions. Then, I hope, we will manage to avert the threat of a catastrophe. [end recording]

So, the United States is preparing to meet the new year. Decorated fir trees stand in the squares of Washington. But at the gates of the White House, there are vehicles heavily laden with sand. Concrete antitankbarriers were recently erected in front of the gates and at the entrances to the State Department building, making it impossible for a tank to pass. The purpose of these fortifications is to defend Reagan's residence and the USA's foreign policy department from attack.

Conducting a policy of international terrorism, highly-placed officials in Washington have evidently themselves fallen victim of hysterical fear of terrorists. As the press reports, antiaircraft missiles have been secretly set up in the White House grounds, ready to hit any aircraft which appears over them without warning. Do not such details of the Washington reality show the atmpsphere which today exists in the United States? [video shows sand-laden trucks and antitank barriers]

EAGLEBURGER REMARKS ON TRUDEAU SPARK 'SCANDAL'

LD240019 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Washington December 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutiy reports:

A big scandal is rapidly flaring up in Washington and Ottawa over the insulting remarks about Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada by Lawrence Eagleburger, U.S. under-secretary of state for political affairs. Speaking at a private dinner here recently, he likened Trudeau's efforts in favour of normalising the international situation to "marijuana-prompted actions of an erratic leftist".

Eagleburger hoped that, considering the closed-door nature of the dinner, his pronouncement would not get into the press. However, it was reported by the Canadian press agency and caused a real commotion in Washington. John Hughes, a State Department spokesman, has stated at a press conference that the U.S. under secretary of state "regrets the report" and that he asked to convey that he has "the highest regard and respect" for Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

Such clumsy excuses sound like an overt jeer. Eagleburger's statement, unprecedented in its impudence, has given rise to a storm of indignation in Ottawa. Allan MacEachen, Canadian secretary of state for external affairs, did not rule out in this connection a possibility of his country's official protest.

The pronouncement by the U.S. under secretary of state has shown once again that Washington lacks any moral "inhibitions" whatsoever and that it is prepared to cast aspersions even upon its closest allies if they, if only in some things, disagree with its interventionist policy and the mad course towards spiralling up the arms race. Thus, Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), in his recent speech made malicious attacks on British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher for her refusal to support the U.S. barbarous armed invasion of Grenada.

As for the statements by the prime minister of Canada as to the need to take the strain off the present dangerous international crisis, they have caused an overt exasperation of the White House. During last week's talks between Reagan and Trudeau, the latter met with Washington's sharp refusal to cooperate in a search for a settlement of the international situation.

All these are manifestations of the Reagan administration's fury over the fact that the events in the world develop not quite how it would like them to develop and that there is mounting indignation around the world over the U.S. dangerous course. However, insults, an outrageous attitude towards the elementary norms of inter-state intercourse, diplomatic etiquette and even decency will by no means add prestige to the incumbent Washington leaders. They only give themselves away completely once again as apologists of brute force, threats and blackmail in international relations.

Ponomarev on 'Boorish Remarks'

LD240339 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow, 23 Dec (TASS) -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Although the bad manners of the highly-placed representatives of the present Washington administration long ago ceased to amaze anyone, they still continue to cause deep indignation. .....

The latest example of this is provided by a coarse, or to put it more correctly, an openly boorish attack by Eagleburger, the U.S. under secretary of state for political affairs, upon Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada, a country that is a neighbor and an ally of the United States.

From earliest times, politics and diplomacy have been spheres of international contact in which even overt enemies adhere to elementary standards of politeness and correct behavior, not to mention neighbors and partners. Alas, the representatives of the present U.S. Cabinet, appointed, as they say, "according to the image and likeness" of their boss, the head of the present Washington administration, are evidently trying to emulate him.

If the President is capable of dispatching Marines and warships in showy fashion in order to crucify the diminutive independent state of Grenada, to encourage armed provocations against Nicaragua, and the brigandage of U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon, why should not his closest subordinates behave in an equally impudent way in the diplomatic sphere?

Is Washington's insulting attack upon the head of the Canadian Government a chance affair? Certainly not. For Canada's prime minister, without asking for the agreement and permission of the White House, has been trying on his own to encourage a lessening of the tension that exists in the world at a time when the Reagan administration is engaged in doing precisely the opposite, when it is whipping up an atmosphere of the threat of nuclear war and openly making preparations for one.

Washington's short-tempered, lecturing tone, its arrogance, and insulting attacks upon the leaders of other governments, even U.S. allies, are, one element in the U.S. "policy of strength" which spares not even the "most devoted friends of the United States." Let us recall the contempt with which Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency and personal friend of President Reagan, spoke of Prime Minister Thatcher of Great Britain when she could not bring herself to openly support the U.S. aggression and seizure of Grenada. The reply they heard in London... [TASS ellipses] but we are not going to repeat those rude words. Let them remain on Wick's conscience.

SOVIETS 'READY TO DEAL WITH ANY U.S. PRESIDENT'

LD260009 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Dec 83

[From 'International Panorama' program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] As you can see, the agitated ideology is beginning to bear its fruit, albeit unripe fruit as yet. But what I have said does not, of course, apply to the idea expressed by Senator Edward Kennedy, the idea of freezing nuclear weapons, that is, production, testing, and deployment. This is, of course, a constructive idea, and here there is something to talk about, something to reach agreement about. But, as you know, Kennedy is a political figure from the opposition camp, and it is Reagan who is in charge in the United States. He evidently wants to remain in charge after November 1984, when the next presidential election takes place in the United States.

Predictions about the outcome of this election are probably the most popular theme at the moment among people engaged in foreign politics. Well, let me say this, the majority agree that Reagan has the best chance. This is possible, of course, although I must admit that I think that Reagan has just as much chance of losing.

But of course, the main thing is something else -- Soviet foreign policy is not by any means determined by who is in the White House, who is head of the White House. The Soviet Union is ready to deal with any U.S. President.

In connection with this, it is worth talking about one widespread thesis being popularized in the West. It boils down to this: The Soviet Union is waiting for the outcome of the U.S. election, and will not enter into any serious contacts with the United States beforehand. This thesis is false. The Soviet Union will have no objection if the matter is one of talks really aimed at strengthening international security. We are in favor of political solutions being ahead of military solutions, and what is required now is an energetic and clear manifestation of political goodwill from the U.S. side.

Unfortunately, this does not yet exist. The President and those around him speak a great deal about the need for drafting some kind of code of behavior in the nuclear age. But what is this code like in the U.S. style? [video shows series of clips of troops taking position, seen through cutouts of maps entitled "Lebanon," "Grenada," "Nicaragua," "Salvador" and "Honduras"]

Naturally, one cannot seek a nuclear code of behavior in these fitful attempts to trample on the right of people to freedom.

'SINISTER' RADIO PROJECT RISING IN MICHIGAN

LD261452 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Washington, 26 Dec (TASS) -- TASS correspondent A. Lyutiy reports:

The roar of bulldozers and the screeching of electric saws are shattering the silence of forests on the bank of Lake Superior near the small town of Marquette (Michigan State). The "woodcutters" engaged in felling trees are not particularly bothered about who needed to destroy the unique and invaluable riches of the national park here. This is understandable. The Pentagon has told them to keep their mouths shut: One of the most sinister projects of the American military, aimed at preparation for nuclear war, is being built in the lakeland pine forests.

"Project Elf" is the codename of the U.S. Marine Corps program for the creation of a modern system of radio communications on very low frequencies with nuclear submarines. This is not the first year that the Pentagon has toyed with this idea. Implementation of this project will make it possible to maintain communications with submarines armed with ballistic nuclear missiles, even where they are in loaded condition. THE WASHINGTON POST writes in this connection that the new system is intended to transmit to the submarines the order to deal a first nuclear strike.

The Reagan administration, hastening the creation of a first-strike nuclear potential, has unreservedly approved the Project Elf idea. The gigantic construction, begun in the Michigan forests without superfluous publicity, will cost $230 million. The framework of the project, earmarked for completion by 1985, entails the planned erection of two large modern transmitters with antennas, the total length of which will be 85 miles.

However, no matter how the Pentagon tries to hide the truth about Project Elf, it has still become known to the inhabitants of the little town of Marquette. The population has angrily come out against plans to turn their native places into a new installation of the U.S. military's nuclear complex. The Municipal Council of Marquette District, lawyer (P. Micklow) reported, has gone to court with a demand that the construction of the militaristic system be halted.

ANALYST REVIEWS REAGAN SOCIAL POLICY

LD270304 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Now almost 3 years since the Reagan administration came to power, it's easy to sum up many aspects of its social policy. More on this from our news analyst Igor Aleksandrov.

Social programs in the United States were not just bestowed on the citizenry. Each of them was preceded by a long and stubborn struggle waged by the workers, by the labor unions, by women's and other public organizations. The goal of that struggle was to lift the social injustice, and to improve life for the unemployed, for the needy, for the ailing and for other underprivileged sections of the population. However, the Reagan administration set out to reduce the achievements gained by the Americans in the past few decades. As a result of these efforts, in the 3 years of Reagan's rule, the Americans lost $110 billion: $26 billion in cut social benefits, such as aid to veterans, various allowances and the like, $27 billion in other support programs, like the food plan, Social Security or unemployment relief, or aid to mothers with many children.

The funds for medical aid were reduced by almost $19 billion. The $7.5 billion-dollar cut in the funds for professional training and for other measures aimed at helping those out of work, and at increasing employment, came as a heavy blow to many Americans.

In 1981 the administration gave two reasons to substantiate its plan for reducing social spending. The first was the attempt to eliminate the budget deficit by 1984. In fact, however, everything the administration did inevitably led to the unprededented growth of the deficit. Vast military spending cut taxation, primarily benefiting the wealthiest people and numerous privileges granted to business corporations. All this brought the budget deficit to $200 billion, which meant the greatest failure in the administration economic and social policy.

The other reason given by the White House was that, not intending to assess the basic needs of Americans, the administration only wanted to prevent idlers from living at the expense of taxpyers. The past 3 years have shown that these pronouncements were meant to mislead the public. In fact, the cuts affected the programs that were essential to the wellbeing of millions of Americans. As the Speaker of the House of Representatives O'Neill said, the administration's policy was aimed against moderate and low income families.

It was clear from the start that President Reagan's goal was to make the rich richer, to make the corporations gain billions of extra dollars, and to bring military spending to an unprecedented level in the interests of the military industrial complex. Ordinary Americans were to pay for all that. A natural consequence of this policy was cuts in federal programs which affected millions of United States' citizens.

GOSBANK CHIEF MEETS WITH ARMAND HAMMER

PM231533 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS reports under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 21 December V.S. Alkhimov, chairman of the USSR Gosbank, had a talk with A. Hammer, chairman of the board of directors of the American company Occidental Petroleum, on questions of interest to both sides.

JAPAN'S NAKASONE GOVERNMENT LOSES, REGAINS RULE

Government Resigns

LD260446 Moscow TASS in English 0442 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Tokyo December 26 TASS -- The Japanese Government headed by Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone resigned today. The resignation followed the December 18 general elections at which the ruling Liberal Democratic Party sustained a serious setback, losing 36 seats and a majority in the lower house of parliament. As the newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN pointed out, the electorate brought in a vote of no confidence in the home and foreign policies of the cabinet headed by Yasuhiro Nakasone. A new prime minister is to be elected at a parliament session which opens today. Late at night a newly-elected prime minister is to announce a government composition.

Nakasone Reelected

LD260804 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Tokyo December 26 TASS -- Yasuhiro Nakasone, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party, has again been elected prime minister of Japan. At a meeting of the lower chamber of the parliament held today the decision to elect Nakasone was supported, apart from the deputies of the Liberal Democratic Party, by representatives of a small right-wing centre party -- the New Liberal Club. The ruling party headed by Yasuhiro Nakasone suffered a serious setback at the general election on December 18 and lost 36 seats and a majority in the lower chamber of the parliament. But after behind-the-stage maneuvres the Liberal Democrats have succeeded in winning over to their side nine "independent deputies" and reaching agreement on cooperation with the New Liberal Club, which has enabled the Liberal Democratic Party to endorse the nomination of their chairman for the office of prime minister.

New Cabinet Announced

LD261819 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Tokyo December 26 TASS -- Japan's Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone today announced the composition of his new cabinet. Shintaro Abe has kept the post of foreign minister, Noboru Takeshita that of finance minister. Yuko Kurihara has been appointed chief of the Defence Agency. For the first time during the stay of the Liberal Democrats in power in Japan a representative of another political party has become a cabinet member. Seiichi Tagawa, the leader of the New Liberal Club conservative grouping with which the Liberal Democratic Party has concluded an agreement on parliamentary coalition has been given the post of the minister for local government.

Election Results Assessed

PM231358 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent K. Rashidov dispatch under the Rubic "Topical Themes: "Why Did the Daruma Fail To See?"]

[Text] The traditional Japanese symbol of wish fulfillment, the daruma -- a huge brightly-painted doll (of the Vanka-Vstanka type) [an upright Russian doll with a weighted base] -- is raised in the place of honor at the headquarters of political parties and groups on the first day of an election campaign. To three cries of "Banzai" from prospective deputies the party leader paints one black pupil on the eyeless doll.

The one-eyed daruma -- a mute witness of fierce election battles -- finally recovers its sight if its owners emerge victorious by gaining the necessary number of seats in the elections.

On the day that the results of the early general elections to the lower house of the Diet were declared the daruma at the ruling Japanese Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) headquarters remained blind. LDP Chairman and Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone, whose brush and black paint -- prepared in advance -- lay close at hand, left the room without even looking at the disappointing talisman. At a press conference held a few hours later he acknowledged his party's "unexpected" defeat, which "requires very serious conclusions" to be drawn. It had lost its majority in the lower house having won just 250 of the 511 seats (before the dissolution of the Diet the conservatives had 286 seats).

Formally, the LDP has already "rectified" the situation by resorting to the tried and tested method of adopting eight deputies who ran in the elections as "independents." Thereby the ruling party has regained its majority in the lower house. But will it be able to cope equally easily with the damage inflicted on its morale as expressed in the open refusal of most Japanese to trust it?

Above all the ruling party's unfavorable election results indicate a condemnation of its political course in both domestic and foreign policy, which, democratic circles believe, has been pursued in the interests of big capital and the military-industrial complex on the one hand and of the United States on the other. In the opinion of many observers the Liberals were also let down by their undermined and unprincipled position regarding the "Tanaka affair," concerning the former prime minister recently sentenced by a Tokyo court to 4 years' imprisonment and a fine of 500 million yen for a bribe which he took from the U.S. Lockheed Company.

The election results were also a concrete reply to the question of how the country perceives the prime minister's own political platform -- specifically, the course toward stepping up Japan's armed forces and increasing military spending and military cooperation with the United States within the framework of its global strategy in the Far East and throughout the world.

However, certain circles within the LDP tend to regard their present defeat not as a serious warning heralding increasing condemnation of the policy pursued by the Japanese Government but as the consequences of what they see as insufficient activity on the part of some ruling party candidates during the election campaign, a shortage of resources, and so forth.

The facts tell a different story, however. The unusual ferocity of the pre-election situation and the crucial nature of the political moment were realized and considered by all parties, and the LDP was undoubtedly no exception. All the indications are that it threw all its forces and resources into the election struggle. At the very beginning the TOKYO SHIMBUN wrote: "Prime Minister Y. Nakasone is literally rushing around the country by all forms of transport -- aircraft, train, and automobile. He has repeatedly stressed the 'bitterness' of the present campaign and the 'seriousness' of the coming elections for the LDP. In his own words, he is not sure that it will manage to maintain the present number of seats."

As for resources, that is, the financial backup for the LDP's election campaign, the facts tell a different story here, too.

At the end of November the newspapers reported that Y. Nakasone had presented 5 million yen at LDP headquarters to the first of his party's 324 candidates to meet the needs of the latter's election campaign. It was also reported that the LDP was allocating about 3 billion yen for its candidates' expenses.

The party leadership appealed to big companies for financial contributions, but the usual "political sacrifices" proved insufficient and it was decided to take a loan with a pledge to repay it in 3 years. Consequently each LDP candidate received 10 million yen, ASAHI explained.

One could cite other examples which confirm that the LDP's defeat has hardly any connection with the changed material and other factors for its candidates. The essence of the question seems to lie elsewhere. The LDP's leaders and above all Y. Nakasone are well aware that since the electors simultaneously unseated three prominent LDP candidates who held ministerial posts in the government, there is little doubt as to whether the cabinet's policy pleases the majority of the country's population or not.

The LDP is also well aware that the prevailing situation requires urgent measures to restore its shaken political influence. This is how observers explain Prime Minister Y. Nakasone's vigorous activity aimed primarily now at smoothing out the sharply worsened discords within the party itself which threaten to turn into overt factional hositility. He is now holding a number of closed meetings with LDP leaders as well as consultations with his advisers and assistants. In the opinion of observers, Y. Nakasone has already secured the support of the majority in the LDP leadership by all accounts and will again be nominated as Japan's prime minister at the coming parliamentary session, when, according to the country's Constitution, the cabinet that he heads must resign.

The discords within the ranks of the parliamentary opposition and its inability to counter the LDP with cohesive unity and a program acceptable to all will help the Liberal Democrats to form another one-party cabinet, political circles here believe.

How will the "lessons" received by the LDP as a result of the current elections be reflected in its policy -- this is still an open question for the Japanese public, which is expecting actions serving the national interests of Japan and its people.

JAPANESE REJECT U.S. BASE ON MIYAKE ISLAND

LD260807 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Tokyo December 26 TASS -- The population of Japan's Miyake Island has categorically rejected the plan for building there a new American military base, which was drawn up by the country's National Defence Agency in order to please Washington. Mass rallies held in the island adopted resolutions saying that the local inhabitants will not permit the creation on their territory of an airfield for the U.S. naval aviation, as this will turn it into an appendage, without any rights, of the Pentagon's militaristic machine. Faced with powerful public protests, the KYODO TSUSHIN agency points out today, the island's municipal authorities were forced to cancel the decision sanctioning base construction, which was earlier taken by them under the pressure of the central authorities.

DPRK SCORES CRUISE MISSILE PLAN FOR S. KOREA

LD231625 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Pyongyang December 23 TASS -- A representative of the Korean Democratic People's Republic in the military commission for the Korean armistice has denounced the U.S. plans to deploy Pershing-2 and cruise missiles and neutron weapons in the south of the Korean peninsula. Addressing a meeting of the commission in Panmunjom today, he said that Washington's actions were intended further to turn South Korea into a staging area for acts of aggression against People's Korea and other Asian countries.

The representative of People's Korea drew attention to the fact that the Pentagon had already deployed in South Korea hundreds of units of nuclear weapons complete with delivery vehicles and also planted a large number of nuclear demolition charges in the demilitarised zone and adjacent areas.

Statements by high-ranking spokesmen for the U.S. Administration, he said, leave no doubt that U.S. strategy envisions the use of nuclear weapons in Korea. This is also indicated by large-scale exercises simulating the use of such weapons that are conducted by the Pentagon in South Korea.

The actions of the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States constitute a gross violation of the Korean armistice and an arrogant challenge to the Korean people and the world at large. The United States must immediately stop its criminal policy, the representative of People's Korea demanded.

SOVIET INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN REVIEWED

LD221859 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0715 GMT 22 Dec 83

[Text] Here is the latest program in the series on topical problems of international life: Afghanistan -- steps of the revolution. At the microphone is the author, foreign policy commentator Yuriy Soltan, who recently visited the DRA.

[Soltan] I had not been in Afghanistan for 13 years. During my first visit, the country seemed to me at first to be sleepy, (?set in its ways), separated from the flow of events and changes going on in the world. However, this was only the appearance. Already in Afghanistan were the latently maturing forces that finally broke the shackles of feudalism. The revolution came in April 1978. The early days were not without their mistakes, and there were serious ones. Some of their consequences are being felt even today. However, the Afghan people had emerged onto the road of a new life. They will not be thrown off this path.

I toured the Afghan capital. Ancient Kabul has grown younger. At the foot of the hills surrounding the town in a circle, there are still mud and daub hovels. However, whole areas of modern housing have sprung up; blocks of new industrial enterprises are growing on the outskirts; It is lively on the streets of the town and in its bazaars; there are many schoolchildren.

In general, it must be said that all Afghanistan is today learning -- learning in the literal and metaphorical sense. It is learning literacy and a new life. In the provincial town of Golbahar, I was invited to a meeting of the local women's organization. The secretary, (Nuriya Gafariya), told me: At the beginning, there were only four of us. We walked around the villages and talked to people, explained to them what the new authority meant to them, and tried to win their trust. We were not always welcomed. People gradually began to believe us, and the women started to take part in meetings and work. Now there are over 100 women in the organization; it was formed 2 years ago. They are studying at course to eliminate illiteracy. They are teaching others and helping those in need. Some of them have even come to work at the local weaving factory, something unheard of previously.

In the Kabul Polytechnical Institute, where Soviet teachers are working, there was a noteworthy event this summer: the defense of scientific dissertations. This was the first time this had happened in the country's history. Since the April revolution of 1978, the words "for the first time" have been used frequently in Afghanistan. For example, take the Afghan countryside. The revolution drove out the feudalists and emancipated the peasants from their feudal dependence, giving them the opportunity to work on their own land. Over the past 5 years, over 350,000 peasant families have received plots of land free of charge. This is a result of the agrarian and water reforms being conducted in the country. However, it is not enough to give land. The peasant, downtrodden in the past and illiterate, must believe that it is really his land, that nobody will take it away from him, and that he is now working for himself. So there appeared a new phenomenon: the creation of agricultural cooperatives. There are already over 1,000 of them. So far, of course, it is only a beginning. People are still learning to work collectively, but how important has been the breakthrough in their awareness, their understanding of the advantageous nature of collective labor, and their feeling of joy from joint work. A total of 63 billion Afghanis is the sum spent by the state over the past 3 years on raising the population's standard of living.

Labor legislation -- again one has to use the words "for the first time" -- has been introduced in the country, enshrining the rights of the working people of town and country. Equality of all tribes and ethnic groups -- and there are quite a few of them in Afghanistan -- has been guaranteed. The people's authority has a respectful attitude to the national traditions and to religious beliefs. It is significant that the National Patriotic Front, the main aim of which is to strengthen the revolutionary gains, contains not only representatives of the working class, the peasantry, and intelligentsia, but also the national bourgeoisie, various tribes, and ministers of religion.

The following fact shows the prestige of the leading revolutionary force in the country -- the PDPA: Over the past 3 years, as I was told at the party Central Committee, membership in the PDPA has trebled. Today there are about 100,000 front-ranking workers, peasants, and representatives of the intelligentsia and armed forces in its ranks.

The international position of Afghanistan is also strengthening. The republic takes an active part in the Nonaligned Movement. Relations with socialist states are developing successfully, as they are with such developing countries as India, Syria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia, and others. The DRA's links with the Soviet Union are especially multifaceted and variegated. During my trip around Afghanistan, I had occasion to meet Soviet people in many provinces of the country. They are doctors, teachers, builders, engineers, and geologists. Altogether, by current agreements, it is envisaged to construct about 170 economic installations in Afghanistan with Soviet aid. There are already 80 operating.

Here is another example: There are no railways in Afghanistan. Buses, trucks and gasoline-carriers are the basic means of transport there. Without transportation the country's life would come to a standstill. Trade with the states neighboring Afghanistan would come to a halt. It is significant that the bandits, the dushmans, primarily attempt to interfere with the country's road transport arteries. They mine the roads and attack freight convoys. The Soviet Union is helping the young republic to organize transport. Last March a 12-month plan for economic and social development was approved in the country. Its main aim is the reestablishment of enterprises damaged or put out of commission by the subversive acts of basmache gangs, and the full resumption of production where it had been totally or partially interrupted. The preliminary results show that the outlined program is being carried out. The assistance of the Soviet Union in this is playing no small role.

A firm foundation for the friendly relations between our countries has been the treaty of friendship, goodneighborliness, and cooperation, which was 5 years old on 5 December. It also serves as a reliable guarantee for the independence of Afghanistan. In the first stage, the Afghan revolution itself defended its country from forces hostile to it. When imperialism and reaction started a broad intervention against democratic Afghanistan, when huge armed bandit formations were thrown onto its territory, the revolutionary gains of the people and the republic's sovereignty were under direct threat. The Government of Afghanistan then turned to the Soviet Union with a request for help, including military help. The Soviet leadership, in accordance with the treaty, and as a result of its interest in guaranteeing its southern frontiers, responded positively to this request.

A limited Soviet military contingent was brought into Afghanistan. Its functions are also limited. The period of its stay in Afghanistan is also limited. The Soviet Government has declared on more than one occasion that the Soviet military units will be withdrawn as soon external intervention ceases. This has not yet happened. The responsibility for the conflict situation in this area is primarily borne by the United States and some of its allies in the NATO bloc. They are cobbling together the bandit formations, training them on Pakistani territory, arming them, and supplying them with modern machinery, including noxious substances. They are sending into Afghan territory subversive groups, terrorists, and provocateurs. All of this is being done against a sovereign state. According to all international norms, such actions are defined as aggression. Armed bandit groups of 10 to 15 men go into Afghanistan by night along secret footpaths from Pakistan -- and partly from another neighboring country, Iran. Weapons convoys are escorted; they gather, if successful, in previously agreed places. The main task is to terrorize the residents who want to work peacefully, kill activists of the PDPA and other progressive organizations, and sow panic.

I have seen bridges blown up by them, kishlaks [villages] destroyed, trucks burned, and electricity transmission cables cut. In a Kabul hospital, I have seen their victims. They are not only wounded fighters of the Afghan Army; they are also peaceful people -- women and children who were passengers on a bus that had been blown up by a mine planted by the basmaches, or people who had simply been bestially mutilated by the dushmans. Who are these dushmans? They are rightleaders who rabidly hate the people's authority, which has deprived them of their previous domination and illegal privileges. They are criminals pure and simple. They are also quite a few deceived, scared, and bought people.

They are criminals, but no less criminal are those who are arming them, teaching them to steal and kill and trample on their compatriots. The addresses of those criminals are also known. The United States alone, according to incomplete data, has spent over $300 million arming and training the bandits. Their ringleaders are received as dear guests in the White House by President Reagan, who presents himself as a champion of justice and democracy. They were also called freedom-fighters by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who visited Pakistan this summer. Incidentally, Shultz also visited one of the camps of the Afghan counterrevolutionary rabble, and wished his brothers in the fight for freedom further successes in reprisals against the peaceful population of Afghanistan. He did not disdain to fly by helicopter toward the Afghan frontier. There, by the Khyber Pass, the foothills of which had already been sighted by the cavalry of Alexander Of Macedonia and by the soldiers of the once mighty British Empire, he looked through binoculars at the -- so inaccessible, but so longed for by the United States -- territory of independent Afghanistan.

At the General Staff of the Afghan Armed Forces, I was shown an operational map. It showed the basic routes along which the bandits infiltrate into Afghanistan, and the areas where they are still actively operating. The bandits are being rebuffed not only by the Afghan Army. Self-defense detachements are being set up at enterprises and agricultural cooperatives. Cases of voluntary surrender of detachments sent into Afghanistan with their weapons and equipment have become more frequent recently. The equipment, as I saw myself, often bears the label "Made in the United States," "Made in England," or "Made in Italy." The people's authority has announced an amnesty to those who had been deceived by the counterrevolution and had taken up arms against the republic but who later admitted their guilt.

I repeat, the Soviet and Afghan leaders have declared on more than one occasion that a cessation and guaranteed nonresumption of foreign interference in Afghan affairs would remove the need for Soviet troops to stay in Afghanistan. A realistic and constructive way was raised by the Afghan Government. The program proposed by Kabul provides for the holding of direct talks between the DRA and its neighbors, Pakistan and Iran. What is more, the Afghan Government is ready, according wishes of the parties, to meet in the negotiating hall either as a threesome or separately with each partner. The Government of Afghanistan has expressed itself favorably on the possibility of holding multilateral consultations to work out international guarantees. Here, of course, it can only be a question of examining the external aspects of the Afghan problem. This is an important observation, for the so-called peace plans being raised by the United States and some other countries boil down to an attempt to discuss and resolve the internal affairs of Afghanistan without even the participation of the country's legal government.

Through the mediation of the representative of the UN secretary general, the first round of Afghan-Pakistani talks was held in Geneva this summer. The discussions are intended to be continued at the beginning of next year. Unfortunately, the process of a political settlement is going extremely slowly. The reason for this, first and foremost, is the active opposition of Washington to the peace talks.

The course of events in Afghanistan shows that the revolutionary process started in April 1978 is irreversible. Those who are weaving intrigues against the Afghan people should understand by now: However they try to prevent Afghanistan from going along the way of independence and progress, their attempts are doomed to failure. The sun of freedom has risen over Afghanistan, and no one can extinguish it.

U.S. 'MILITARY AID' TO ANTI-AFGHAN 'BANDITS' SCORED

LD221547 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Dec 83

[Text] According to a report in the U.S. weekly NEWSWEEK the United States has decided to increase its allocations for direct military aid to anti-Afghan bandits. Instead of the $100 million in the Pentagon budget for the current fiscal year, the terrorists will receive $125 million. At the microphone is journalist on international affairs [Vladimir Beloshapko).

The NEWSWEEK report reminded me of one of Ronald Reagan's campaign speeches. Under my administration, stated Reagan as a presidential candidate, the United States will not wring its hands and make excuses. That is perhaps one of the few election promises that Reagan is fulfilling with enviable firmness and consistency. What excuses are used when the United States, without thinking, takes actions against sovereign states and crudely interferes in their internal affairs, with the aim of establishing its own order everywhere -- Grenada, Nicaragua, Lebanon and of course Afghanistan. Whereas it previously modestly tried -- unsuccessfully -- to deny its involvement in any undeclared war against the DRA, now it even brags about it. Official U.S. representatives are not only happy to have meetings in Washington with the heads of the anti-Afghan mercenaries but also have a special section in the Pentagon budget for expenditure on arming and maintaining them.

It is true that the sum of $125 million is clearly understated. Add another $300 million that is spent on maintaining around 100 special camps in Pakistan, where bandits are trained by instructors from the United States and certain other countries.

Also add those millions the terrorists receive through CIA channels, and then you can get an accurate picture of the scale of Washington's direct involvement in anti-Afghan machinations. Indeed the basmaches are under the protection not only of the United States but of some of its allies as well.

What these funds are spent on is well known: on the death of peaceful Afghans; on blowing up enterprises, schools, hospitals, thousands of kilometers of destroyed roads. That is the price paid by the Afghan people for the generous guardians of the basmaches across the ocean. However, it seems to me that no handouts from Washington to the counterrevolution will be able to reverse the history of Afghanistan. The people of the republic are filled with resolve to defend the gains of the April revolution and is proceeding firmly along its chosen path despite hostile attacks from outside. In this matter it has reliable friends and allies.

U.S. 'Undeclared War'

LD221212 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 22 Dec 83

[Aleksandr Levchenko Commentary]

[Text] The victory of the April Revolution in Afghanistan and the progressive changes effected by the people's power in that country gave rise to malice and hatred among the forces of international imperialism and reaction. An undeclared war was unleashed against the young republic. Its aims were not concealed, either in Peshawar, which has become the main camp for the counterrevolutionaries, or in Washington where the bandits' ideological inspirers were to be found. Millions of dollars are generously handed out to all kinds of reactionary groupings that strive to liquidate the gains of the Afghan people.

The United States allocated more than $200 million for this in 1983 alone. U.S. imperialism and the forces of reaction rely primarily on the internal Afghan counterrevolution, made up of those of fuedal and landowning origin and commercial aristocracy. More than 80 subversion centers were set up in Pakistan with American money. Reactionaries received training there in how to blow up bridges, mine roads, set fire to schools and organize ambushes. They are subsequently transported over the border to make practical use of the knowledge gained. Moreover, each subversive action was paid for by the Americans according to a set tariff: from 300 to 1,000 Afghanis.

Not infrequently, the counterrevolution also spread rumors, alleging that the new authorities oppressed the faithful and destroyed mosques. This lie was to have spurred on the population against the revolution.

However, it has long been known in Afghanistan who really destroyed the mosques. The number of victims claimed by the basmaches among the clergy is already beginning to approximate the number of PDPA activists who fell at the hands of the bandits. And these killers, marauders and traitors of the Afghan people are not only described as patriots and freedom fighters in the West, but are also received with honors in the White House.

Thus the United States demonstrates that it will support the undeclared war against Afghanistan's legitimate government. America wishes for a settlement of the Afghan problem that entails the overthrow of the people's democratic power and the establishment of an openly reactionary regime.

In order that the real aims of U.S. policy in the region should not be as glaringly obvious as they are, a propaganda noise was started in the West and attempts were made to portray white as black. Apart from that, extensive opportunities were given to the counterrevolutionaries to speak on the radio, while prominent U.S. magazines print their interviews with satisfaction. However, even this action of the special services, a delaying action, so to speak, is meeting with failure.

This is what (Roger Maria), a French journalist who recently visited Afghanistan, has told me in an interview:

[Begin recording in French fading into translation] After my trip to Afghanistan, says (Roger Maria), I was able finally to understand the situation: Having unleashed an undeclared war, the United States decided to overthrow the Afghan Government with the aid of counterrevolution, and to make the country follow American policies. In this way, the White House and the CIA strive to compensate for the loss of their positions in Iran following the overthrow of the Shah. This is obvious. However, Western media daily proclaim that it is allegedly the Soviet Union that pursues the goal of conquering Afghanistan, while the United States is portrayed as the helper of true patriots. Despite the obvious falsehood of assertions of this kind, some people in France believed these cock-and-bull stories.

After my stay in Kabul, Roger continues, I became firmly convinced that the Soviet Union's support for Afghanistan helped the young republic to stand fast and to rebuff the attacks of the counterrevolution. Western propaganda alleges that the Russians have conquered Afghanistan. But as a journalist, Roger emphasizes, I state that this is not true. There was indeed internationalist help from the Soviet Union and there is development of Soviet-Afghan trade and economic ties.

To those in the West who do not yet have a definite view, French journalist(Roger Maria) said in conclusion, I suggest they go to Kabul and determine the situation for themselves, just as I did. [end recording]

TERRORIST INCIDENT IN AFGHANISTAN DETAILED

PM221807 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Ustinov "Afghan Reportage": "Volleyballs and Grenades"]

[Text] Mazar-E Sharif/Kabul -- It was the third day of our stay in Balkh province. A group of the country's leading irrigation workers headed by the sector's minister, Akhmed [as published] Shah Sorkhabi and several Soviet specialists were here studying a very important problem for the years ahead -- how to supply the north of the republic, the Afghan bread basket, with water to irrigate millions of hectares of land. I had flown here with them with my Polish Press Agency colleague Ryszard Piekarowicz.

Balkh right now is a sea of very fine, penetrating dust, blinding sun, and relentless summer heat.

From morning to evening we drove and, where the all-terrain vehicle could not pass, we walked, along the steep, rocky banks of the province's canals, met with mirabs [water allocation officials], peasants, and representatives of the local authorities, and went up and down the storage areas in the settlement of (Khayratan) on the border with the USSR, where powerful bulldozers, tractors, crane trucks, graders, and trucks sent from our country specially for this program stood ready to fight the sand and stone. However tight our schedule, we would spend a couple of hours in the sarandoy (people's militia) battalion recently created to guard the land reclamation workers and irrigation installations.

We spent the night in the settlement of a well-known nitrogenious fertilizer plant, situated 20 kilometers from the provincial center of Mazar-E Sharif. This leader of Afghan industry, started up 10 years ago with the assistance of Soviet specialists, is now surrounded by an extensive housing unit with modern well-equipped apartments, a school, health center, hotel, and sports complex.

I must say that young Afghans are enthusiastic volleyball players. Mass sport is only just penetrating the republic. They have not had time yet to build complex sports facilities like swimming pools. A volleyball court is another matter. You will find one at virtually every school and major establishment or enterprise.

During our visit to Balkh Province the nitrogenous fertilizer plant held its fall sports day. The organizing committee was headed by (Zalmay), the settlement's favorite, a tall good-looking athlete of magnificent ability. He, it is true, was not yet working at this plant. He would be taking his school graduation examinations in the spring. On the sports day he was ubiquitous. But at 1700, as the best player and captain, he led the plant team out on the volleyball court. The main event of the sports festival -- the match against the volleyball players from the petrochemical technical college in Mazar-E Sharif -- began.

The hotel is situated 100 meters from the sports facilities and, attracted by the fans' enthusiatic shouts, we went outside. There was no possibility of getting through to the court -- it was surrounded by densely packed local volleyball experts and enthusiasts. Minister Sorkhabi and several of his staffers went off to walk through the green avenues of the settlement. I returned with my Polish Press Agency colleague to the hotel and we began setting out the pieces on a chessboard.

As we were doing so the sound of a powerful explosion rang out from the direction of the volleyball court. "A mine?" Piekarowicz asked. "Seems like it!" I answered. We both ran out toward the sports facilities.

Those who live or work in Afghanistan are not surprised by stories of sabotage and terrorist acts. They are today probably the main weapon of the revolution's enemies. But it is one thing to hear or even write about these things and quite another to actually come face to face with such crimes.

The first person we ran into, halfway toward the court, was the minister's interpreter, (Said). He was pressing the palm of his hand against his blood-stained forehead and when he saw us he asked in an agitated voice: "Do you have a clean handkerchief? Someone threw a grenade into the center of the court, right at the players' feet. There was a hail of splinters. And there are many injured."

Attracted by the explosion, our chauffeur drove up. We put (Said) in the car and sent him off to hospital. The UAZ automobile made off slowly, constantly stopping and picking up new passengers. An old man, supported by a young boy, walked past us. A dark trail of red spots stretched out behind his right leg in the dusty road. The old man's face was austere and unruffled.

The minister and his accompanying staffers came out of a side avenue. Sorkhabi was distressed.

Car after car headed toward the hospital from the volleyball court. When Piekarowicz and I reached the scene of the incident there was no longer anyone there. All that remained were dark stains on the sand and empty spectators' benches.

An hour later it became known that 52 people had been injured by the grenade explosion, 17 of them seriously. At that very moment one fan died on the wound-dressing table.

Soon Mohammad Sarif, first secretary of the provincial party committee, Balkh Governor (Gulyam Khaydar Dzhamali), and (Salekh Sharifi), director of the nitrogenous fertilizer plant, arrived at the scene of the incident. The 35-year old enterprise head paced gloomily up and down the room and said:

"I have just been with (Salmay's) family. His mother and sisters are weeping. The boy is seriously wounded. I spoke with the doctors: It appears that he will live but will no longer take part in sports. And we were wanting to put him forward for the country's Olympic Squad...."

"But why did they do it?" Piekarowicz asked, uncomprehendingly. "Causing an explosion on a volleyball court....It is not a munitions store, after all, it has no strategic value. It was a sports festival...."

"But that is the whole point, it was a festival! Sharif said, slapping the table in anger. "The dushmans do not like our new way of life, they do not like the fact that we watch television or play volleyball and that refrigerators, washing machines, furniture, and bedclothes are finally appearing in ordinary workers' homes. We are providing people with education, work, excellent housing, and confidence in the future. What can the revolution's enemies offer in return. They are consumed by impotent spite. And so, instead of a ball, you have a grenade flying across the volleyball court...."

The first secretary's words were interrupted by a telephone call. It was reported by the settlement's security service that the bandit who had thrown the grenade had been arrested. He had been disguised in an Afghan Army uniform and his presence at the match had not aroused anyone's suspicion. He was now undergoing interrogation....

"I am certain that he is a member of the Mulah Salam's gang." The governor said. "This cutthroat is among the revolution's ideological enemies. He was formerly an important feudal lord, owning the best land in the Balkh River valley. When the agrarian reform began and these fields were shared out among his former laborers he went off to the mountains where he created a dushman gang. Salam poses as a defender of Islam. He burns down schools because 'irreligious' subjects such as algebra, physics, biology, and geography are studied there and hunts down the intelligentsia and students of literacy courses."

...Our plane was leaving for Kabul that morning. On the court, not far from the hotel, we saw an enormous gathering of people with placards and revolutionary flags. A rally of the fertilizer plant workers, members of their families, and all the settlement's inhabitants was being held. A rally of sorrow, a rally of protest, and a rally of loyalty to the revolution's behests. We stopped and listened for some minutes to the speech by the first secretary of the provincial party committee.... The day was only just beginning but it was already noisy on the carefully sanded volleyball court. A group of lads of 12-13 were beginning a match. A well inflated white ball was flying over the net.

ARTICLE DEVOTED TO USSR HELICOPTER PILOTS IN DRA

PM221917 [Editorial report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 December 1983 Second Edition frontpages an "Afghan Photo Diary" by Engineer Lieutenant Colonel V. Sukhodolskiy entitled "Helicopter Pilots." The article reads as follows:

"The sun was still only stealing up on the mountain edge from the invisible side of the range, lighting up the sky in the east, but the helicopter pilots' work was already in full swing. At first light the helicopter pairs took off, and, rising above the ground, they greeted the sunrise. A dense shroud of dust lay over the deserted airfield for a long time, as though mist had descended on Afghan soil....

"The dust would settle, and the crews would return from their missions -- from the distant villages of Badakhshan, from (khayraton), from ancient Herat. Work....

"Their whole life is intertwined in an inextricable tight knot: combat training with daring strikes against the 'enemy' and flights carrying freight for Afghan friends, sometimes in unfamiliar regions and frequently under dushman fire. There are many young officers in the squadron. Each day makes them stronger: They fly a lot here and fulfill very diverse tasks.

"'I am pleased with the lieutenants,' Major Yevgeniy Trubin, squadron commander, said. 'Many have received incentives from the command.'

"Heroes of the Soviet Union officers Vyacheslav Gaynutdinov and Vasiliy Shcherbakov, the celebrated helicopter pilots and the pride and glory of the subunit, flew over this land, in these skies. They are an example for the lieutenants to imitate.

"I remembered that on one of the recent holidays Lieutenant Colonel Vasiliy Vasilyevich Shcherbakov, an academy student and a quiet officer of few words, had been among KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's guests. But they -- the lieutenants -- did not meet him, and they were still wearing cadet uniform the year that Shcherbakov became a hero. They did not think that they would be flying over the same mountains, along the same routes.

"The squadron commander looked at the airfield and said:

"'Go up to the lieutenants. Photograph them. Let their relatives see them. They have deserved it. And then let's do some flying...."

The article is accompanied by two photographs taken by the author. One shows four helicopters flying in mountainous terrain and bears this caption: "The photograph was taken from on board a helicopter piloted by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kondrashkin, military pilot 1st class. Lieutenant crews are flying." The other photograph shows three young men in flying helmits, who are named as "Technical Service Lieutenant Igor Koshcheyev, flight technician; Lieutenant Vyacheslav Lezhnin, pilot-operator; and Lieutenant Igor Ivlev, helicopter commander."

DRA POLICIES HAILED FOR IMPROVING PEASANT LIFE

LD231059 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 23 TASS -- TASS commentator Vladimir Plastun writes:

Almost every day the press of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan carries reports on formation in provinces of committees which are to give peasants assistance in solution of questions of distribution of water on fields and other vital problems. The water-land reform in the country is being carried out in accordance with the programme of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

Heavy was the lot of the Afghan peasant before the April revolution of 1978. A bigger part of arable land was in the hands of a group of landlords. They leased their land to peasants and usually took at least a third or half of the harvest. Sometimes the landlord's share was as much as 80 per cnet. A third of peasant family of Afghanistan did not have land at all. Debts of fathers and grandfathers were passed on to sons and grandsons. The poor peasant not always had a possibility to take land on lease. Meanwhile more than half of arable land which belonged to landlords remained uncultivated every year. As a result, the country all the time needed food. Poor harvests, natural calamities doomed many people to starvation.

The revolution put an end to that situation. The people's Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by the very first decrees annulled the debts to usurers and landlords of more than 11 million peasant families. Distribution of land began in the country since January 1979. As many as 300,000 families received land by the summer of that year.

At the new stage of the revolution the programme of transformation in Afghanistan's agriculture was reconsidered and supplemented considering local traditions, special conditions of different areas and customs. The work has begun to form agricultural cooperatives. The state grants them credits, loans, provides with fertilizers and seeds, and also agricultural implements at easy prices. Recently the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan took the decision to reduce for peasants by 20-40 per cent prices for chemical fertilizers and agricultural implements and to simultaneously increase prices of their products by 20-30 per cent. Such a policy of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the revolutionary government is close and understandable to the toiling peasantry and cannot but be supported by them.

In conditions of Afghanistan water means life. This is why the government, in addition to the existing irrigation systems, drew up another 32 projects of building new irrigation systems. More than 300 peasant revolutionary committees now conduct observation over fair distribution of water.

There are naturally difficulties and primarily these difficulties are linked with the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan which is being continued by the United States and its NATO allies, with bandit sallies of counter-revolutionaries. Therefore not all cooperatives work at full capacity. In a bid to thwart field work, rebels destroy irrigation canals and dams, burn down harvests, herd away cattle.

The peasants decided to defend their land and the revolution. As far as in February 1980 the first agricultural conference of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan took the decision on formation of peasant self-defence units. The Afghan peasant now knows that this is his land, he defends it, he defends the future of his family and the homeland.

AFGHANISTAN PROTESTS PAKISTANI AID TO 'BANDITS'

LD231503 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Kabul December 23 TASS -- According to the BAKHTAR NEWS AGENCY, a charge d'affairs of Pakistan was summoned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, where a protest note was handed over to him in connection with the provocative actions of the Pakistani side.

"Aggressions, subversive and instigating acts have been taking place by Pakistani side from a military post against the customs and other civil officers of the DRA in Torkham for some time in the past", the note points out. Each concrete incident of this kind was reported to the Pakistani authorities by corresponding channels. The instigations and hostile aggressions have caused human losses. The latest time when such incident occurred and the Pakistani Government was informed of it was December 14.

Unfortunately, the Pakistani authorities did not take any action to prevent the recurrence of attacks and provocations, but instead, as reliable testimony shows, are even intensifying them, the document points out further.

According to the information in possession of the corresponding authorities of Afghanistan, on December 18 this year, a group of bandits supported by the Pakistani frontier guard units and Pakistani light and heavy armaments including artillery attacked the customs house and other civil establishments of the DRA in Torkham. They burned the customs building and plundered its assets. The attacks resulted in the loss of life and considerable material damage, and severely disrupted the regular work of the customs house. According to the recent reports, the shelling of the Afghan territory from Pakistan is going on.

By all appearances, the Pakistani authorities are striving to give new dimensions to their hostile acts, including armed intervention in the affairs of Afghanistan from their territory, the note points out further. If these hostile actions fraught with very dangerous consequences are continued, the Pakistani authorities will be directly responsible for it.

This intervention and provocative activities which run counter to all the generally accepted international norms and the UN Charter intensify tension in the region and if not prevented will affect negatively peace in the region and all over the world.

Lodging a strong protest to the Government of Pakistan in connection with the above mentioned provocative activities, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan expects the Pakistani authorities to take steps in order to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

SWEDISH TV AIRS PROGRAM ON ANTI-SOVIET ESPIONAGE

LD231739 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Stockholm, 23 Dec (TASS) -- For a long time Sweden's special intelligence services have been carrying out radioelectronic espionage against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This was the subject of a program prepared here by journalist (Peter Lebue) and shown on Swedish television's second channel.

It was said in the program that Caravelle reconnaissance planes, which carry out regular flights over the Baltic and also toward the North Pole, are used for that purpose. They have on board up-to-date electronic equipment, which enables the crew -- usually consisting of 8 to 10 men -- to collect espionage data on the Soviet hinterland.

It was also pointed out in the program that the FRA [expansion unknown] defense radio service is allocated no less important a role. The FRA has at its disposal a network of radio centers with the headquarters on the island of Luva, not far from Stockholm. Many millions are allocated every year to maintain the FRA. That service is occupied with intercepting radio communications. It was pointed out as an example that the FRA pays close, sustained attention to Czechoslovakia, Poland, and adjacent areas.

All this was confirmed in the program by the head of the defense intelligence section, Ulf G. Samuelsson. The latter also pointed out that Sweden exchanges the information gathered "with a number of other states, which is a natural form of collaboration."

It appears from the TV film that the FRA and other Swedish intelligence bodies are subordinated to the government and they keep the latter informed of their espionage activities. As Swedish Minister of Defense A. Thunborg said: "The government receives information from the military department. Then it decides with whom it is necessary to exchange the data gathered and to what extent."

SWEDISH OFFICIALS ON NEED FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

LD231202 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Stockholm December 23 TASS -- To avert a nuclear threat is the most important task of mankind -- this is the conclusion drawn by the participants in a press conference which was held here by the publishers of the "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists," a major scientific edition of the United States.

Speaking at the press conference, Sweden's Defence Minister Anders Thunborg strongly criticised the theory on "a possibility" of conducting "a limited" nuclear war and attaining victory in it. Any nuclear war, said the minister, will inevitably grow into a world nuclear conflict. The minister declared for a substantial reduction in the stockpiled nuclear arsenals, for maintenance of the military balance at the lowest possible level of armaments, including nuclear.

The Swedish Government, the minister said, feels anxiety over the fact of the termination of negotiations between the USSR and the United States on disarmament and limitation of nuclear armaments. The utmost efforts should be exerted in these conditions in the search for ways of continuation of the dialogue.

The Stockholm conference on measures of building up confidence and on security and disarmament in Europe which is to open in January next year will be of great significance in that respect, stressed Anders Thunborg.

One of the leaders of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Rolf Bjernerstedt noted that on the strength of their professional knowledge and experience the sicentists know more than others on consequences of a nuclear conflict and therefore bear special responsibility for the future of the planet.

Deputy of Swedish Parliament from the Centre Party, former Foreign Minister of Sweden Karin Soeder called for a full ban on the production and development of neutron weapons. She declared for destruction of the chemical weapons.

WEST EUROPEAN 'CRITICISM' OF REAGAN 'INCREASING'

LD261932 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 26 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Robert Serebrennikov writes:

Now that the year 1983 is running out, the West European allies of the United States are filled with anxiety. They are intimidated and worried by President Reagan's unpredictable actions, by the reckless bellicosity of the present Washington administration.

Can one rely on a responsible attitude of the President of the United States, who according to the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES, is prepared to shoot right and left, is steeped in war psychosis and anti-communism? This question is now asked by many in Western Europe where people are concerned over the United States policy of international gangsterism and armed ventures pushing the world to nuclear catastrophe.

This is why the criticism of the militaristic course of the Reagan administration is increasing on such a scope in Western Europe.

The eyes of many Western Europeans were open to real aims of the United States -- speeded up deployment of new U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons on the European Continent, a brazen aggression against Grenada, the U.S. armed intervention in Lebanon reminiscent of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

The escalation of the United States international brigandage results in the fall of trust in the Washington administration. The West European press points out that doubts are growing about President Reagan as an ally and leader of the United States, about his capability of acting reasonably in conditions of a crisis.

These important changes in the public opinion of Western Europe have been reflected in various polls. Thus, 73 per cent of British voters no longer trust any American guarantees and believe that the United States will disregard Britain's objections to a possible use of cruise missiles that are being deployed on the British isles. Two thirds of the FRG population reject the "Pershing II" missiles that are being imposed by the Pentagon and NATO. As many as 70 percent of the Greeks polled have no confidence in Reagan's policy either. A profound concern of the Western Europeans is caused by Washington's provocative course with regard to the Soviet Union.

According to the poll held, 58 per cent of people in Britain hold that Reagan's policy makes war more likely, and also reject Washington's attempts to blame all the calamities of the present-day world on communism.

Ever more often official Washington complains that "anti-American sentiments" are quickly increasing in Western Europe, that the United States prestige is swiftly falling.

The reason behind this is clear: The recent events dispelled completely the illusions about any positive evolution of the policy of the Reagan administration. Sober-minded politicians, ordinary people ask with concern how far the present U.S. Administration can go for the sake of achieving its imperial aims in its unpredictable actions for the implementation of the insane theory of "limited war" or implementation of the sinister plans of the "crusade" against peace, democracy and socialism.

This is why on the threshold of 1984 the peoples realize ever more clearly the need to heighten vigilance so as to prevent Washington from crossing the line separating peace from war.

BRITISH PUBLIC CONCERNED WITH NUCLEAR THREAT

LD241602 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 24 Dec 83

["Well-Understood Concern" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 24 TASS -- TASS commentator Vadim Biryukov writes:

The municipal council of Congresbury (Britain) supported by a majority of votes the proposal of the local physician Richard Lawson to give death pills to those residents who want to avoid slow and agonizing death as a result of nuclear war.

The representative of the medical profession believes that the death from a dose of morphia is more humane than death from consequences of a nuclear explosion. What made the British physician to make such a recommendation?

Washington's intention to unleash in Europe "a limited" nuclear war gave rise everywhere to profound concern of West Europeans. The dangerous neighborhood of American nuclear missiles is being imposed upon them. Thereby they are being turned into the target of a retaliatory nuclear strike, into the Pentagon's nuclear hostages.

The concern of rank-and-file Britons grows even stronger since the Tory government fully supports Washington's militaristic course, it allowed deployment on British soil of American first strike nuclear weapons. Moreover, official London allowed American troops in Greenham Common to open fire on unarmed Britons -- participants in the anti-war movement.

One can understand the Congresbury municipal council: Britons view their future in a grim light. But it is not of death pills that one should think now. It is human reason alone that can now save Europe and the whole world from the formidable danger. It is only joint actions of all people that can stop nuclear maniacs from Washington.

TURKISH FIGURES ON CRUISE DEPLOYMENT PLANS

LD231642 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 23 Dec 83

["Dangerous Plans Harbored" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Ankara December 23 TASS -- Reports appeared in the Turkish press of late that the United States harbors plans to deploy cruise missiles on Turkey's territory in addition to U.S. medium-range missiles that are being deployed in a number of West European countries.

These reports gave rise to serious concern in the Turkish public circles. Many prominent Turkish figures, political observers arrive at the conclusion that it is far from accidental that this information "leaked" into the local press. This is Washington's probe to establish a possible reaction of various political circles of Turkey before these plans are officially announced.

Former Turkey's Minister of National Defense Haluk Bayulken said in an interview to the newspaper "GUENAYDIN" that the rumors of the planned deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in Turkey are spread deliberately by the United States to find out the reaction of the Turkish public opinion. Prominent diplomat, former member of parliament Kamuran Inan said that no one can compel Turkey to accept the deployment of U.S. missiles against its will. Reflecting the opinion of broad Turkish circles, former minister of national defence Hasan Esat Isik stressed that deployment of new U.S. missiles on Turkish territory would aggravate the situation in the world still more.

SPANISH CP DELEGATES CRITICIZE CONGRESS REPORT

PM211002 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Chernyshev report: "At the Spanish Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Madrid, 16 Dec -- The routine 11th Spanish Communist Party [PCE] Congress, being held here, has concluded the debate on the accountability report. The delegates noted in their speeches that the communist party is experiencing a serious crisis, which was particularly evident in the PCE's defeat in the October 1982 parliamentary election. The speakers' main attention focused on stating their views on the reasons for, and the ways to overcome, the differences within the party which were especially exacerbated during the precongress period. Spokesmen of the delegations from Madrid, Valencia, the Basque country, and others noted that the accountability report lacked a serious analysis of the political and social situation in the country and failed to explain the sources of differences within the party. Many delegates consider that the report failed to provide a scientific, class evaluation of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, aimed at easing international tension and reducing the threat of nuclear war, and practically places the aggressive NATO bloc and the Warsaw Pact on the same footing.

During the vote, 386 delegates voted to approve the accountability report, 376 voted against, and 25 abstained. Afterward, the congress work continued in commissions.

BRIEFS

USSR-NORWEGIAN COOPERATION GROUP -- Oslo, 19 Dec (TASS) -- The third session of the permanent working group on USSR-Norwegian economic and industrial cooperation has taken place here. At the session, the state of and prospects for the development of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries were discussed. A further growth in the 1982-1983 trade turnover was noted. The sides discussed the possibility of developing Soviet-Norwegian cooperation in the assimilation of the Barents Sea shelf and in mutual deliveries of power-engineering equipment for hydroelectric stations, the modernization of cellulose and paper industry enterprises for the production of rural housing, and deliveries of ships and shipping equipment. During the meetings and talks between representatives of Soviet foreign trade organizations and Norwegian firms took place, and a number of contracts was signed. An agreement was reached to hold the next session of the working group in the USSR in 1984. [Text] [Moscow TASS in Russian 1836 GMT 19 Dec 83 LD]

'ARAFAT DEPARTURE FROM TRIPOLI 'LOSS' FOR ARABS

LD252322 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Dec 83

[From 'International Panorama' program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] As you know, the evacuation of Yasir 'Arafat and 4,000 of his supporters from Tripoli in northern Lebanon recently took place. Well, is this a gain or a loss for the Arabs? I think it is a loss. However, there are other points of view. Some state that henceforth, 'Arafat will cease to be the leader of the Palestinian resistance movement and the PLO itself will, in essence, be dissolved. But there are also other points of view. For example, the reasoning is expressed that if 'Arafat were able to withdraw his supporters under the UN flag and provide for a French military convoy, then this once again shows his high political art. Incidentally, since 'Arafat left Lebanon, he has already met with Mubarak, the president of Egypt. This is a very significant meeting. At the moment, it is being commented on in quite a lively fashion, although I do not think there are any grounds to talk about 'Arafat and his supporters revising their approach and their attitude to the Camp David process in general.

The fundamental elements of the Middle East crisis remain, but there are new features, not only in what is taking place in the PLO and around this whole problem. There is also something new in what the Arabs are paying as a result of their disunity, and there is something new in the fact that both the United States and Israel are having to pay. The costs are serious, they are payment in the form of men's lives, economic payment, especially painful for Israel, and it is political cost, when the United States is of course stumbling on growing annoyance and indignation among the Arab states, not only Syria, of course, but also the so-called moderate Arab countries. In fact, the whole situation might be compared to a kind of political boomerang which hits not only the victim, but the aggressor as well. And this is, if you like, a logical law of our times.

YAR PRESIDENT RECEIVES PLO'S 'ARAFAT IN SAN'A'

LD261936 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] San'a' December 26 TASS -- Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, today arrived at the head of a group of Palestinian fighters in the North Yemen port of Hudaydah.

'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, president of the Yemen Arab Republic, has met in San'a leader. According to the news agency SANA, in the course of the meeting the North Yemen president stated his country's firm support for the just struggle waged by the Arab people of Palestine for the full restoration of their legitimate rights and for the establishment of an independent national state.

PALESTINIAN FRONT LEADER SPEAKS ON ANNIVERSARY

LD232338 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Sixteen years have past since the establishment of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP], one of the major factions of the Palestinian resistance movement. Members of this front struggle against the Zionist occupiers outside the occupied homeland and inside.

The occupiers have thrown scores of them into jails; however, they continue their struggle there as well. Taking part in this program is Comrade Abu Nidal, member of Palestine National Council and member of the PFLP

[Begin Nidal recording] First of all, I would like to greet all the masses of our people in the occupied homeland. I say to them, to my comrades, and to all strugglers within the Palestinian revolution that despite the huge and strangling crisis through which the Palestinian revolution is passing these days, we are confident that the road of the revolution is paved with thorns, blood, and all kinds of suffering. The revolution was never at any time an easy road. It has never slept on a mattress of silk. The revolution always means blood, sweat, and effort; and means first and foremost the hope in victory because this is the road of the people. The road of peoples is the road of victory regardless of all suffering and martyrs, and regardless of all our detained comrades and all the tragedies suffered by our Palestinian people in Jordan, Lebanon, and now everywhere.

Despite all that, I would like to say on the occasion of the 16th anniversary of the start of the PFLP that we take the opportunity of this day to renew the hope, determination, and conviction that the obstacles we face today and the crises we pass through will not bend our determination. We will continue the struggle and will continue with you and by you and with all our friends and allies and all our comrades until we achieve victory.

Your popular front, my comrades, in all honesty, has come to represent a response -- organizational response, military response, popular response, and struggle response -- to the occupation and the manner in which the occupation should be confronted. We are by you and with you, honest to the revolutionary course that the popular front has adopted for 16 years.

We give you our pledge in the name of the front's leadership, its strugglers, fighters, every mother who has lost her child, and every martyr and every detainee to remain honest to the struggle and to the march until our people achieve their objectives in liberating their homeland completely. [end recording]

SYRIA'S AL-ASAD STRESSES FREEDOM FROM ISRAEL

LD261227 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Damascus December 26 TASS -- The actions of the so-called "Multinational Force" in Lebanon, consisting mostly of American troops, have transcended beyond the framework of the proclaimed aims of their establishment, it was stated by President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria. In an interview to the French weekly LE POINT, distributed by SANA agency, he said that the Armed Forces of the United States have become a direct participant in the affairs of that Arab country, and conducting combat operations against the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and Syrian troops from the inter-Arab peace-keeping force in Lebanon. Washington's actions are of an openly aggressive nature.

All that we strive for in Lebanon, President al-Asad stressed, is to free it from Israeli occupation. In this connection it is our duty to give the people of that country assistance to counteract the Israeli imperialist plans.

Syria, the president noted further, has conducted and will conduct struggle for a just settlement of the Palestinian problem which is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. We come out for the creation of a Palestinian state under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole lawful representative of Palestinian Arabs.

Peace in the Middle East is impossible without a just solution of the Palestinian problem. Hafiz al-Asad supported the United Nations resolutions on this question and condemned the positions of the United States and Israel.

The president of the Syrian Arab Republic spoke highly of Soviet-Syrian relations and characterized them as "relations of friendship," cooperation and mutual respect". "The USSR," Hafiz al-Asad stressed, "is giving us sincere assistance and support in the struggle against the Israeli aggression, for the liberation of occupied territories and the restoration of flouted rights, for a just and lasting peace in the region.

PLO'S 'ABD RABBUH HITS U.S. 'MILITARIST COURSE'

LD250801 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 25 Dec 83

[Text] Damascus December 24 TASS -- (From TASS correspondents D. Zelenin and N. Levchenko) The accords reached recently betweer Washington and Tel Aviv within the framework of the so-called U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation are directed against the national interests of the peoples of the Middle East. They fully fit into the U.S. global militarist course and the adventuristic policy of the White House, Yasir 'Abd Rabbuh, member of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, has stated in an interview with the TASS correspondents. He pointed out the danger of armed provocations by the U.S. military against Syria, the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and the Palestinian resistance movement. The United States and Israel, by preparing an aggression against the Arab national-liberation movement, pursue the aim of suppressing the Arab peoples' resistance to neocolonialism's onslaught in the region, 'Abd Rabbuh went on to say.

The Palestinian figure stressed that imperialism and Zionism seek to consolidate at all costs the shackling agreement with Israel, the agreement which has been imposed upon the Lebanese people by the United States and which tramples the sovereignty and independence of Lebanon.

'Abd Rabbuh urged the patriotic forces of the Arab world to strengthen the unity of their ranks in the face of imperialism's and Zionism's intrigues. He gave a high appraisal of the stand of the Soviet Union which renders support to the Arabs' just struggle for their legitimate rights.

W. EUROPEAN PUBLIC DEMANDS LEBANESE WITHDRAWAL

France, Britain 'Refuse'

LD241234 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 24 Dec 83

[Text] Paris December 24 TASS -- The Governments of France and Britain refuse to heed the demands of the broad sections of the public in their countries demanding a withdrawal of the French and British contingents from the so-called "multinational peace-keeping force" in Lebanon. The French defence minister, Charles Hernu, now on a fact-finding tour of Lebanese regions where the French troops are stationed, declared that Paris does not intend to pull out its 2,000-strong contingent. His British counterpart Michael Heseltine said in London that the withdrawal of the British troops from Lebanon is out of the question.

Press commentaries note that Paris and London are treading in Washington's footsteps contrary to their national interests, which is fraught with their countries' involvement in the conflict that has nothing to do with them. The press quotes in this connection the Italian President Alessandro Pertini as criticizing the U.S. actions in Lebanon and favouring a withdrawal of the Italian contingent from Lebanon. The Italian president is quoted as stressing that Italy is risking involvement in a war it does not need.

Italy Urges Withdrawal

LD231554 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] London December 23 TASS -- Italian President Alessandro Pertini told journalists today that the Italian contingent of the "Multinational Force" in Lebanon should be withdrawn from there.

He emphasized that Italy, which has sent 2,200 troops to Lebanon, risked getting entangled in a war that did not involve it. The Italian president also said that the Americans were in Lebanon to defend Israel.

"Let's speak clearly," Pertini said, "they are there in defence of Israel and not of peace and they are bombing Lebanon with tons of bombs. Why must our soliders die, even if they are volunteers?"

ALGERIAN PARTY CONGRESS OUTCOME REVIEWED

LD231153 Moscow TASS in English 0949 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] Algiers December 23 TASS -- TASS correspondents Konstantin Dudarev and Vadim Lagutin report:

Documents of the 5th Congress of the National Liberation Front Party of Algeria, which ended Thursday in the capital of that country, express profound concern over the present-day aggravation of international tension.

A political resolution of the congress stresses the need to step up efforts in the struggle for the termination of the arms race and for restructuring international relations on the basis of equality and justice. Algeria supports the idea of turning the Mediterranean basin into a nuclear-free zone, into a zone of peace, cooperation and goodneighborliness, the document of the forum underlines.

Delegates of the congress went on record in favour of the consolidation of the unity of Arab countries, voiced their support for the national liberation movement of nations and reiterated spirited solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people under the guidance of their sole lawful representative -- the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The document emphatically denounces the strengthening U.S.-Israeli alliance and stresses that it poses a serious threat to the very existence of Arab countries.

The final resolutions of the congress reiterated the need to further pursue and deepen the socialist orientation course aimed at building in Algeria an advanced society with equal rights for all the citizens. The congress endorsed the main guidelines of the five-year plan of socio-economic development of the country for 1985-1989 and outlined general tasks of national development for the period ending in 2000.

Speaking at the concluding meeting, Chadli Bendjedid, general secretary of the National Liberation Front Party and president of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, stressed that the resolutions of the 5th Congress were a political program of the activities of the party and the government. He set the task to educate the growing generation in the spirit of allegiance to the ideals of the Algerian revolution so that they carried out in practice the choice in favour of socialism made by the Algerian people.

Chadli Benjedid was reelected to the post of the general secretary of the party. He was also nominated to be the only candidate for presidency in that country.

U.S. OFFICIAL CALLS FOR AL-QADHDHAFI'S 'REMOVAL'

LD232350 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] A former national security adviser to President Reagan has called on the United States government to expedite the removal of Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. He also urged the United States to eliminate other governments contrary to U.S. interests. Our observer Yuriy Reshetnikov, in his commentary, discusses this statement.

Joseph Churba, one-time adviser to President Reagan and currently president of the conservative Center for International Security, told a news conference in Washington that the U.S. Government should strive to topple the government of Libya. He implied that such a measure should not exclude assassination of the Libyan leader. The United States should go to the source of actions that are contrary to America's national interests snapped the former Reagan adviser.

Sentiments such as those expressed by Joseph Churba are certainly nothing new in the United States but coming from a former Reagan aide such views cannot be written off as something inconsequential. Indeed, this idea of going to the source of what he termed unacceptable political behavior appears to reflect the Reagan administration's mentality. By proclaiming a worldwide campaign against what it calls international terrorism the Reagan team, since its early days in office, virtually put on notice the rest of the world that every government would have to pass Washington's standards of legitimacy. From then on acceptable political behavior would have to be determined by Washington alone.

Needless to say, governments that do not happen to toe the line drawn by the United States would be dealt with according to the recipes bluntly described by Joseph Churba. And Mr Churba's remarks were not merely empty talk. For a number of years the United States has been engaged in both open and covert operations to topple the government of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, which has troubled Washington by its independent, anti-imperialist policies. The United States provided training, arms, and financial assistance for anti-Libyan forces outside and inside the country. There have been numerous attempts on the life of the Libyan leader and in 1981 U.S. Air Force fighters shot down two Libyan planes, trying to provoke an all out military conflict with the United States.

The Sandinista government of Nicaragua has also fallen into the category of countries with unacceptable political behavior. With the help of the CIA the United States is engaged in an open effort to topple the Nicaraguan Government. In fact, no country pursuing a course independent of the United States can feel itself free of Washington's heavy handed tactics. The most instructive case study of such behavior lately has been the invasion of Grenada. Not only the country's independence has been snuffed out by America's brute force, Genada's experience at the hands of the Yankees was clearly meant as an object lesson to teach other nations what Washington means going to the source of un-American behavior.

OPENING AGENDA FOR SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

LD251538 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Dec 83

[Text] We will report, first of all, that the 9th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 10th convocation will open with a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities on 28 December at 1000 in the hall of sessions of the supreme body of the country's state authority, the Great Kremlin Palace.

The previous day, 27 December, there will be a session of the Council of Elders of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

REGISTRATION OF SUPREME SOVIET DEPUTIES BEGINS

LD261028 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Excerpt] At this moment in the Kremlin, in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium building, the registration of deputies for the highest organ of state power in the country, who are arriving for the ninth session, is beginning.

The session, which will open 28 December, is scheduled to review the plan for economic and social development and the USSR budget for 1984, and also the fulfillment of plans for this year.

DRAFT PLAN, BUDGET APPROVED AT PLENARY SESSION

LD232017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 23 Dec 83

[Text] At the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 10th convocation it is planned to discuss the Plan of Economic and Social Development and the budget of the country for 1984, as well as the course of fulfillment of the plan in the present year.

Two hundred and fifty deputies arrived in Moscow in good time for the preliminary discussion of the documents tabled by the USSR Government. The preparatory commissions began their work as early as October. There has been a thorough analysis of the carrying out of the plan of 1983. Unused reserves and potentials were brought to light. Measures were proposed for improving the balancing of all the sections of the plan and budget for next year.

A plenary session of the plan and budget commissions was held at the Kremlin today, with the participation of representatives of other standing commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the main, the drafts of conclusions regarding the plan and the budget were approved, as were the drafts of the coreports of the plan and budget and other commissions. It was decided to hand them for final discussions in the Standing Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Later today, at the concluding meetings of the standing commissions, these documents were confirmed. The chairmen of the plan and budget commissions of the two chambers of the supreme body of state authority of the country were instructed to deliver the coreports at the session.

Kuznetsov at Session

LD240030 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Dec 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A plenary session of the Budget and Planning Commissions of the Houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet took place in the Kremlin today. Representatives of other permanent commissions also took part. The concluding sessions of the permanent commissions of the Houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet also took place today.

Reports were heard from the leaders of the preparatory commissions on the results of the preliminary examination of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1984 and of the fulfillment of the plan this year; of the country's State Budget for 1984; and of the report on the execution of the budget for 1982. The conclusions on the plan and budget were approved, as, too, were the supplementary reports of the budget and planning and other permanent commissions.

A session took place of the Legislative Proposals Commissions of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Draft provisions concerning libraries in the USSR were discussed at a joint session of the Public Education and Culture Commissions and the Legislative Proposals Commissions of the Houses in accordance with the instructions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Taking part in the work of the commissions were Comrade Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and the leaders of ministries, departments and public organizations.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM HELD 26 DEC

TANJUG on Opening

LD261451 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1435 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow, 26 Dec (TANJUG) -- The CPSU Central Committee Plenum began this afternoon in Moscow. Issues relating to the USSR plan and budget for next year will be reviewed.

It is reported that the report of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was read at the plenum.

It is expected that an official statement will be made this evening on the first day's work of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Andropov Absent

BK261628 Hong Kong AFP in English 1624 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow, Dec 26 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov today failed to attend a plenary session of the Communist Party Central Committee, according to analysts in the Soviet capital.

The official news agency TASS, in its first dispatch from the closed-door session, said that participants "were acquainted with the text of a speech by the (Communist Party) general secretary", which they heard with "great attention", leading observers to believe that Mr Andropov's speech had been read by someone else or distributed to delegates.

Other extracts from the speech reported by TASS were quoted with the mention "it was said" in the text, rather than quoting Mr Andropov directly.

69-year-old Mr Andropov has not been seen in public for more than 130 days, and is officially suffering from a "chill".

But it appears certain that he is seriously ill. Western sources in Moscow believe that he is suffering from kidney failure.

Andropov 'Address'

PM262012 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 83 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Text of Address [Vystupleniye] by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

I deeply regret that because of temporary causes I will not be able to attend the session of the plenum. But I have attentively studied all the materials that form the basis of the plan for the coming year. I gave them much thought and was preparing to speak and outline some of my considerations. That is why I am sending the text of my speech to the members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee, members of the Central Auditing Commission, participants in the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee.

As you know, with due account for the exchange of views that had taken place, the Politburo of the Central Committee has decided to submit to you for discussion the drafts of the plan and budget for 1984 that were drawn up by the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The questions that the plenary meeting is to study are vitally important for the country. It is of much political importance that simultaneously with the setting of tasks for the future we are assessing the fulfilment of the decisions of the 26th congress, summing up the results of the work done in the period since the November 1982 Plenum of the Central Committee and analyzing accomplishments and shortcomings in order to make correct conclusions for the future.

The implementation of some measures to perfect our economic management, enhance organization, strengthen state, labor and plan discipline has been started in the country this year.

This has facilitated in many ways the success in improving the state of affairs in a number of sectors within a comparatively short period of time, in enhancing the initiative and responsibility of cadres, their confidence in their strength and in raising the creative activity of the masses. This course has got the full approval and support of communists, of all working people.

People have begun working with a better mood. The rates of economic growth increased, and quality indicators have somewhat risen. In general, a change for the better in the national economy has begun to show. All this confirms the correctness of the line has been worked out, the practicability and substantiated nature of the tasks set by the party to develop the economy and to overcome the existing difficulties.

As we see, the results are manifest. But this is only the beginning. The most important thing now is not to lose the tempo and the general positive mood for action, and more actively to develop positive processes.

An analysis of the planned targets for 1984 shows that the planned rates and proportions conform in the main to these tasks and consolidate the positive tendencies of the current year. I think that comrades will agree with that. The plan to a greater extent than previously is oriented towards raising the efficiency of production. Its social orientation is being intensified. Everything necessary has been envisaged to maintain the country's defense capacity at a proper level. Thus, the draft plan meets the political and economic strategy of the party and, I believe, can be endorsed by the plenum.

In several days' time, upon being endorsed by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the plan will become a law of economic life of all the branches of the economy, of thousands of enterprises, amalgamations, and organizations. It will serve as a determinant of the working rhythm of the production shops, sectors, production teams, and of millions of workers, of all those who through dedicated labour create material and intellectual values and strengthen the might of our motherland.

In the conditions of the present international situation, which has been sharply aggravated through the fault of the aggressive imperialist circles, the strict implementation of the State Plan becomes not just an obligation but also a patriotic duty of every Soviet person, each work collective, and each party and public organization.

It is very important that a good start be made from the very first days of the new year and that one get disposed towards a further increase of intenseness in work, without allowances for difficulties, of which there are a good deal ahead.

It is essential, to begin with, to focus attention on the most urgent matters, the so-called bottlenecks, on the solution of which the success of the work will depend.

Comrades know that the plan for 1984 was not easy to form. It is balanced with a certain strain. This has been influenced, of course, to a considerable extent by the known defects [nedorabotki] in the national economy and by the quality of planning itself. But whatever the reasons given as explanation, we are bound to ensure a successful implementation of the plan, and the paramount condition for that is efficient organization of the entire work both in the center and locally.

It is obvious that already at the first stage, in each sector and in each work collective, one should have a clear idea of by what ways, through what means and methods the high targets inherent in the draft plan will be implemented to economize all types of resources, materials, feedstock, and energy, to raise labor productivity and boost the manufacture of consumer goods.

It is essential to thoroughly consider all this again and again, and during the implementation of the plan constantly and persistently to look for additional reserves to ensure an uninterrupted functioning of the national economy.

The task can be set in a party manner only thus: It is necessary to ensure the implementation of the plan without fail, but in so doing to use every opportunity for exceeding it. This must be the aim of the entire economic activity, socialist emulation, economic, organizational, ideological and educational work of the party, trade union, and Komsomol bodies, and local soviets. The most important thing after a plan is worked out, as Lenin said, is to "be able to arouse both competition and initiative among the masses, so that they set about the job straightaway" ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 52, p 39).

I would like to note that a number of documents have been adopted recently with a view to further developing the initiative of working people. These are, first of all, the law on work collectives and resolutions on the tightening of discipline, on the development of the team form of the organization of labor, etc.

The ability of economic leaders and public organizations to enlist people's efforts and to achieve high ultimate results of work should be judged from how the party decisions will be translated into practical deeds at every enterprise and amalgamation.

When discussing the draft plan, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee supported a proposal to set a concrete task to the party, trade union organizations, and work collectives -- to achieve an above-plan growth of labor productivity, say, of 1 percent and to cut down the production cost of output additionally by 0.5 percent. This should be regarded as the party's additional assignment to the plan.

Comrades Viktor Grishin, Dinmukhamed Kunayev, Vladimir Scherbitskiy, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, and Eduard Shevardnadze reported that the foremost collectives of Moscow and Leningrad, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Georgia, and of other cities are ready to come forward as initiators of such a movement.

This deserves the most ardent approval. The elaboration and adoption of obligations should be orgaized on this basis everywhere, special economy accounts should be opened for enterprises, construction projects, state farms, and all organizations, and those who will achieve the best results should be actively encouraged.

Other diverse forms of the people's initiative may also become a good additional contribution to the implementation of the plan of 1984 and of the 5-year period as a whole.

A movement for raising the shift index of equipment was widely developed in the country at one time, for example. Subsequently it began to fade out unjustifably. Herein are vast reserves of growth of both the efficiency of production and labor productivity.

Really, what picture can be observed now? Take the country's biggest Kharkov tractor works. In 1980-1982 the machine-tool fleet at the enterprise grew by nine percent while its shift index went down from 1.5 to 1.41 This is explained by the lack of labor resources while demands for more and more equipment are voiced with enviable persistence and with no particular concern for how it will be used.

But there are different examples, too. A compulsory procedure to certify whether workplaces correspond to the rules of scientific organization of labor has been introduced at the Dnepropetrovsk Harvester-Manufacturing Factory which is, incidentally, subordinated to the same Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machinery Building. As a result, within 3 years, with an increase in output, about 600 workplaces were cut down or, in other words, considerable labor resources have been found at the factory without any special capital outlays.

There is no doubt that combined with an energetic effort to automate production it is this approach that makes it possible to tap tremendous reserves of the growth of labor productivity.

Regrettably, over recent years the movement for the speediest achievement of the designed labor input per unit of output has been practically forgotten. It ought to be said bluntly that proper concern for reducing labor inputs is not yet shown in a number of sectors. If one remembers pre-war years, though, there was a vigorous drive underway then to expedite the achievement of the designed labor inputs.

We ought to revive also the movement for increasing the shift index of machinery and achieving the planned labor inputs per unit of output. And, of course, to do this on a new organizational and technical basis. There is hardly needed any proof that this will make it possible to boost output substantially, while slashing production costs. The ministries and departments as well as the planning agencies should seriously ponder how to carry out the related measures.

The next question. The resolution of the Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the fulfilment of contractural obligations for the supplies of products has much significance in the system of measures to tighten discipline. All indications are that this measure has somewhat improved the situation in the national economy. But facts also indicate that this fundamental problem has not yet been resolved fully.

The responsibility of the economic executives for fulfilling contracts and orders has been raised. That is true. But there still are "loopholes" allowing the payment of bonuses where the supply quotas have not been met in full. The planning agencies have even legalized a special term: "The maximum percentage of underfulfilment". True, the instruction makes the reservation that this indicator of lack of discipline -- there is hardly any other way of calling it -- should be limited to one or two percent and only in exceptional cases to three percent.

But if it is allowed in principle to violate contracts, some executives use this "right" to the full. Say, a number of engineering ministries this year have applied the maximum limit of underfulfilment of contractual obligations to nearly half of their factories.

Quite understandably, the discipline of supplies depends not only on the factories but also on the material and technology supply agencies, transport, all those managerial links that are called upon to ensure that the production process goes on without interruptions and maintains a steady rhythm. And everyone involved in this process should, in the event of contractual obligations not being honored, answer for this to the extent of his guilt.

The USSR Council of Ministers should examine these issues, work out corresponding proposals, and enforce proper order.

There is also another problem that deserves most careful attention. Our planning agencies, ministries and departments have not yet come up with the necessary solutions to ensure that the production, scientific and technological potential available in the country be used fully and most efficiently.

Let us take, for example, the huge capacities that have been created in the chemical and petrochemical industries as well as in engineering over recent years. Many of them have not been used in full for a long time because of intrasectoral and intersectoral lack of coordination and disproportions.

It appears expedient that each ministry, the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR State Material and Technological Supply Committee should work out as soon as possible special measures to eliminate the bottlenecks and disproportions that keep down the efficiency of utilizing the production potential.

And, of course, we are duty-bound to work constantly and persistently to accelerate scientific and technological progress. Many industries are now advancing faster and more confidently in this direction. The new decisions taken after the November plenum and the important experiments staged to stimulate the development and introduction of new technology have given an appreciable impetus to this headway.

But the organization of the entire package of scientific and technological work is far from being efficient. Some industries are marking time and failing to fulfill plans to introduce new equipment, the scope of these plans themselves leaving much to be desired. The state of affairs in the national economy demands a decisive turn by the ministries, departments and the USSR Academcy of Sciences toward raising the technical standards of production and improving the quality of products.

Much will depend on how we shall be able to mobilize the staffs of factories, scientific research and design organizations, engineers, technicians and scientists for intensifying scientific and technological progress. This is a task of priority importance. We must and can accomplist it.

Every year, when discussing social and economic development plans, we are compelled to dwell upon the problem of capital construction. This can be understood. The scale of capital construction in the country is vast. There is a direct link between capital construction and the fulfilment of our plans to increase industrial production, consolidate the material and technological foundation of agriculture, and improve the living conditions of the working people and the cultural and daily life amenities available to them.

Regretably, the state of affairs in this most important sector still cannot satisfy us. A number of facilities and projects are not commissioned on schedule.

The heads of building organizations often enter upon lengthy explanations of their work failures and look for objective causes behind them. What is needed, however, are not explanations but real improvements in the state of things in construction.

Tremendous public funds have been invested in this sector, there has been created a well-developed industrial base, there are competent design organizations, and the building sites are now better stocked with machinery.

The key to success there, just as, incidentally, elsewhere, is in raising the responsibility of the personnel and strictly demanding from them an irreproachable execution on their duties, efficiency, initiative and unconditional fulfilment of the set tasks. It is from this standpoint that we should appraise the work of our building ministries and their collegiums and territorial agencies, and the performance of the managerial staff. Particular exactingness should be displayed in supervising the fulfilment of plans to build housing, schools, hospitals, child-care pre-school establishments, communal facilities, and everyday services establishments.

Transport operations demand the unremitting attention of the economic, party and soviet bodies. Of course, there have appeared positive trends there of late. But in transport there are perhaps more reserves and latent opportunities that can be opened up and tapped within a short period of time than anywhere else.

This refers first of all to reducing the irrational carriage of goods. It is apparently needed to make a thorough study of this question and work out essential measures to achieve proper order in the deployment, specialization and integration of production and to exclude the many unnecessary cross hauls that are burdensome to the economy as a whole.

This present-day scale and pace of development of productive forces demand changes in the attitude to questions connected with environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources. This is a task of major economic and social importance. For what is at issue in effect is protecting the health of the people and taking a careful, thrifty approach to the country's national wealth. Moreover, these are also questions of the future. Their resolution will determine the conditions in which the succeeding generations will live. It must be stressed that despite the serious efforts being made by us, this problem on the order of the day remains acute.

This indicates that work for the protection of nature requires even more persistent and purposeful efforts. A narrow departmental approach is intolerable in this field, perhaps, more than in any other field, as it sharply lowers the effectiveness of the use of capital investments, hampers the pursuance of a single policy in carrying out nature protection measures, engenders irresponsibility for the ecological consequences of the decisions taken, is conducive to illusory economy, which, in the final analysis, results in great losses. In a word it is necessary to show a comprehensive approach to this problem from the nationwide positions, resolutely improve the whole system of environmental management and control.

Comrades, all of our efforts in the economy are aimed in the final analysis at ensuring a rise in the living standards of the people. This is the main socio-political objective of our plans. Any successes in the development of production are appraised at their true worth when they result in an improvement in the living standards of the people.

Quite a lot is being done in this respect in our country. The real income of the population is steadily on the rise, the construction of housing, cultural and every-day service facilities is done on a large scale, education, health protection and culture are successfully developing. The plan for 1984 provides for a further rise in the living standards.

As before, the implementation of the Food Program requires much attention. The measures carried out this year have made it possible to improve somewhat the supply of the population with a number of foodstuffs. For the first time noticeable progress has been made recently in such an important field as livestock production. Purchases of milk, meat and eggs have increased. The feed base has strengthened. This gives hope for a further change for the better next year, too. To this end it is necessary that the Central Committees of the Communist Parties and the Council of Ministers of the union republics, the local party, soviet, and economic bodies, the workers of the countryside ensure a successful wintering of cattle, a successful carrying out of spring sowing, in a word, make another step toward increasing the output of field husbandy and livestock production.

It is the paramount duty of the party and soviet bodies of the republics, territories, regions ministries and departments to increase persistently the use of the potential created in agriculture, the returns from the resources channelled to the development of the agro-industrial complex for resolving in full the problem of the supply of the population with foodstuffs.

One of the urgent tasks remains to satiate the market with the necessary manufactured goods. Under the conditions of a growth of the purchasing power of the population and the level of the supply of people with various commodities, the demands made on the assortment and quality of products have considerably increased recently. Yet industry is extremely slow in readjusting itself to the manufacture of modern consumer goods.

At the wholesale fair of recreational and household goods intended for sale in 1984, trade organizations refused to purchase 500 thousand TV sets, 115 thousand radio sets, almost 250 thousand photographic cameras, one and a half million watches and clocks, 160 thousand domestic refrigerators and a number of other products because of the disparity between the quality and assortment of these goods and the demands made by the buyers.

It is intolerable that with a shortage of many products on sale, high-quality raw and primary materials are wasted on the manufacture of products, which are unmarketable, will then be stored in warehouses and their prices will inevitably be marked down.

There are also facts when because of a lack of efficiency on the part of officials in trade and industry, lack of knowledge of the real demand of the population, of the situation in the market, some products alternatingly become scarce, or accumulate on store counters and at factories. This entails not only a restructuring of production and losses, but also discontent among the population.

The incomplete satisfaction of the demand of the population for goods is a source of negative phenomena, including profiteering. It goes without saying that it is necessary to further resolutely combat this disgusting phenomenon using all means which the state has at its disposal. Yet the main point is that it is necessary to increase output, improve the quality of goods constantly, intensively develop the sphere of services, so as to eliminate fully the shortage of both goods and services. This should be made the personal responsibility of executives of every rank both in the center and in the provinces. This time has apparently come not just to talk about shortages in the production of goods for the people, but about concrete officials standing behind these shortages. The party, soviet, and economic bodies shall keep this most important problem under their constant control.

As is known, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee has found it necessary to draw up, within the five-year plan for 1986-1990 and the guidelines for the long-term economic and social development of the USSR, a comprehensive programme for the development of the production of consumer goods and the system of services for the population encompassing the most important aspects of the life of the Soviet people.

We, certainly, should not wait until this work is completed, and must resolve the pressing problems without delay, step by step.

In outlining the current objectives, we must not overlook the strategic problems in the development of the economy.

We will have to itensify considerably work to perfect economic management and further enhance the initiative of work collectives.

We attach much significance to carrying out at a number of ministries an economic experiment for widening the rights of enterprises and increasing their responsibility for the results of work. In the course of the experiment some new elements of management will be tested. Their results will serve as a basis for preparing relevant proposals for the economy as a whole. It is necessary to prepare for that in advance in other branches too. We should enter the twelfth 5-Year Plan Period with a well-adjusted economic machinery allowing for an even fuller use of the potentialities of our economy.

I must say that quite a lot has been done recently to improve the quality of the state plans.

Still, our planning mechanism has many weak spots. Some cardinal tasks of economic development often seem to be adapted to the actual conditions in individual regions and branches. We should consistently abandon this, so to say, passive approach in planning.

The selection of the most effective directions in the development of the national economy, of the chief elements which make it possible to swiftly advance the country's economy along the path of intensification, is one of the most pressing tasks of perfecting planning and management.

In this connection, I would like to share some thoughts.

Concrete forms of management and planning must correspond to the real conditions of each stage in the country's social development. This is an objective regularity which, quite obviously, no one can either change or cancel. That is why the improvement of the management system, based on the principles of democratic centralism, is an integral part of the overall process of perfecting our social system.

The issue of working out a programme of all-round perfection of the entire mechanism of management has become ripe. This mechanism should fully correspond to the economy of developed socialism and to the character of the tasks that are being handled.

I think that this program should provide for:

Perfection of the organizational structure of management at all levels and in all sectors of the national economy, including a clear definition of the functions, rights and responsibility of management bodies and of enterprises, organic combination of the interests of the state and of work collectives:

Improvement of the planning system in the national economy proceeding from the demands for higher socioeconomic effectiveness of social production;

Higher effectiveness of economic levers and stimuli of the economic mechanism in their entirety, including price-formation, credit-financial system, methods of evaluating the results of economic activity, etc.

Only an all-round and comprehensive study of the issues of improving the management system may resolve the tasks of the fullest use of the advantages intrinsic in the socialist method of production. This should become an important integral part of the new edition of the CPSU Program.

These are some issues which I thought it necessary to dwell upon. Of course, they do not exhaust the range of economic problems that demand solution, the more so, as life constantly advances new ones.

Our successes will depend to a decisive extent on the mobilization of the masses, on the people's creative attitude to work assigned to them, on further development of socialist emulation.

Of major importance is the thorough selection of cadres according to their business and political qualities, education of true organizers of production, resourceful, able workers. The attitude of goodwill to them, which has been established, must be combined to a still greater degree with high exactingness and principledness.

All these are the immediate tasks of party work.

A report and election campaign is currently drawing to an end in the party. The meetings and conferences, already held, demonstrated total support for the course of the 26th party congress, November and June plenums of the Central Committee, orientation of all party organizations at resolute perfection of the style and methods of party guidance. We view this as a pledge of the successful solution of the new tasks of further advancing the national economy, of raising the well-being of the Soviet people.

Comrades, in conclusion, I would like to share with you thoughts about the lofty role and responsibility of the members of the CPSU Central Committee, of all the participants in the plenum of the Central Committee present in this hall to the party and to the people.

We roused the working people, aimed them at good work and simultaneously encouraged great expectations by the collectively elaborated decisions of the November plenum. A great deal has been achieved, but much is still to be done.

Millions of communists and non-party people infinitely trust the party and are prepared to support the measures for further improvement of the situation in the economy and in other spheres of social life. This places immense personal responsibility on all of us, on everyone without exception, and we should justify this profound confidence of the people.

No matter where members and candidate members of the Central Committee, members of the Central Auditing Commission might work -- in the government, or sectors of the national economy, in party, Soviet bodies or in science, in the sphere of culture or in the diplomatic field -- we all must always remember that we are political leaders and we must place highest the interests of the party and of the people.

The main thing today is setting the tone and showing a fitting personal example in work, doing everything for the development of the economy and social relations, for improving the life of the people, and being invariably guided in this activity by the lofty Leninist principles.

Reports Debated; Plenum Ends

LD271256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Dec 83

[News report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum]

[Text] Today the CPSU Central Committee Plenum continued its work. Taking part in the debates on the report by Comrade Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1984 and on the report by Comrade Garbuzov, USSR minister of finance, on the State Budget of the USSR for 1984, were the following:

Comrade Gusev, first secretary of the Saratov Obkom; Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Bashtanyuk, fitters' and adjusters' brigade leader at the Kama Association Foundry Works for the production of large capacity trucks in Tatar ASSR; Radyukevich, director of the Magnitogorsk Lenin Metallurgical Combine; Gromova, machine milking foreman at the Kommunarka State Pedigree Stockbreeding Farm in Moscow Oblast; Lomako, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy, and Kachin, first secretary of Kamchatka Obkom.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum unanimously adopted a resolution on the questions debated, which is published in the press. The plenum then ended its work.

'Information Report'

PM262054 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 83 First Edition p 1

["Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"

[Text] A regular plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee began its work 26 December 1983.

The plenary meeting heard reports by deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR N.K. Baybakov "On the State Plan of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1984" and the Minister of Finance of the USSR V.F. Garbuzov "On the State Budget of the USSR in 1984".

It was with much attention that the participants in the plenary meeting acquainted themselves with the text of a speech by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yu. V. Andropov. The speakers in the discussion voiced full support for the provisions and conclusions contained in this important political document noting that they are of principled importance and should be placed at the base of the activity of all party, soviet and economic bodies, public organizations, and work collectives.

The text of the speech of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov is published in the press.

Speaking in the discussion were Comrades Grishin, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Lyashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers; Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; Grishkyavichus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; Zaykov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom; Askarov, first secretary of the Chimkent Obkom of the Kazakhstan Communist Party; Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Afanasyev, minister of heavy and transport machine building; Vlasov, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingushetia Obkom; and Gorshkov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee examined organizational questions.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee made Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov and M.S. Solomentsev, who were candidate members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, full members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The Central Committee plenum elected CPSU Central Committee member Comrade V.M. Chebrikov to candidate membership of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee elected member of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade Ye. K. Ligachov secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum continues its work.

VOROTNIKOV 'PROMOTED': TASS PROVIDES BIOGRAPHY

LD261804 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 26 TASS -- The regular plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee today promoted Vitaliy Vorotnikov from alternate to full membership of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

Vitaliy Vorotnikov, a Russian, was born in 1926 and joined the CPSU in 1947. He began his work career as a fitter's apprentice at the locomotive repair works in Voronezh, central Russia, in 1942. Upon graduating from a specialized secondary school he worked in engineering and technical posts at an aircraft building plant in Kuybyshev on the Volga River. He graduated from an aircraft institute on a part-time basis.

From 1955 on Vitaliy Vorotnikov has been working in the party and government as the secretary of a factory party committee, a secretary and second secretary of the Kuybyshev regional party committee and chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kuybyshev Regional Council of People's Deputies.

In 1971 he was elected first secretary of the Voronezh regional party committee and subsequently was appointed first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

In 1979 he was appointed the Soviet Union's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Cuba and in 1982 was elected first secretary of the Krasnodar Territory Party Committee.

In June 1983 Vitaliy Vorotnikov was appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

He was elected in member of the CPSU Central Committee in 1971. The June 1983 plenary meeting of the Central Committee elected him an alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

He is a deputy of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the Russian Federation of several convocations.

SOLOMENTSEV 'PROMOTED'; TASS PROVIDES BIOGRAPHY

LD261756 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 26 TASS -- At today's regular plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Solomentsev was promoted from alternate to full member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

Mikhail Solomentsev, a Russian, was born in 1913. He joined the CPSU in 1940. He began his working life in a collective farm in 1930. On graduating from the Leningrad Polytechnical Institute he worked from 1940 at industrial enterprises in the town of Lipetsk (Central Russia) and then in the Urals. He was a foreman, shop manager, party organiser of the CPSU Central Committee at a plant, chief engineer and, starting with 1949, director of a plant in the town of Chelyabinsk in the Urals.

From 1954 he was a secretary and then second secretary of the Chelyabinsk Regional CPSU Committee, and chairman of the Chelyabinsk council of the national economy. From 1959 on Mikhail Solomentsev worked as first secretary of the Karaganda regional party committee (Kazakhstan), and second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and first secretary of the Rostov regional party committee.

In 1966 Mikhail Solomentsev became a secretary and department head of the CPSU Central Committee, in 1971-1983 was chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. The June 1983 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee made him chairman of the Party Control Committee at the CPSU Central Committee.

Mikhail Solomentsev was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee in 1961. In 1971 he was elected an alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

He is two times Hero of Socialist Labour and a deputy to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the Russian Federation of several convocations.

DISCUSSION THEMES FOR SUPREME SOVIET ELECTIONS

PM231440 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed "Suggested Themes for Lectures, Reports, and Talks in Connection with the USSR Supreme Soviet Elections"]

[Text] Elections in our country are convincing evidence of genuine people's power.
V.I. Lenin on socialist democracy.
Soviet society is a society of real democracy.
The USSR Constitution is the embodiment of Leninist principles of people's power.
The CPSU is the leading and directing force of Soviet society.
Soviet power is the power of the people and for the people.
The USSR is a socialist state of all the people.
The CPSU's activity to further develop socialist democracy.
The law on labor collectives is a new step in broadening working people's rights.
The socialist way of life is our great gain.
The reality of USSR citizens' rights and freedoms.
The equality of nations and ethnic groups in the USSR.
The unity of the Soviet persons' rights and duties.
The strict observance of Soviet laws is the duty of every USSR citizen.
Labor is the basis of our motherland's might.
Raising labor productivity is a key task.
Economy and thrift are a matter for everyone and a common concern.
The level of labor discipline is an indicator of a collective's ideological and moral maturity.
New demands on the organization of socialist competition.

The team contract is an efficient form of labor organization.
Daily attention must be of high quality.
The scale of housing construction in our country.
State concern for the Soviet person's health.
The social security system in the USSR.
The USSR Supreme Soviet is the supreme organ of state power.
The Soviets are a school of state administration for the broad masses.
The Soviets' role in working people's communist education.
Candidate deputies are true representatives of the people.
The democratic nature of the Soviet electoral system.
The law on USSR Supreme Soviet elections.
The powers and activity of electoral commissions.
The bloc of communists and nonparty members is the embodiment of the indestructible unity of the party and the people.
Our country in the period between USSR Supreme Soviet elections.
Between elections. (Changes in the economic and social life of the collective and the region).
Deputies' mandates: How they are fulfilled.
The role of trade unions in Soviet society.
The Lenin Komsomol is the party's active assistant.
Soviet women are free and equal members of society.
The experience of party, war, and labor veterans is our priceless possession.
The Soviet peoples's patriotism and internationalism.
The accessibility of free nature [besplatnost] of education in the USSR.
The flourishing of socialist multinational culture.
Ideological and mass political work is a matter for the whole party and the duty of every communist.
Mass political work at places of residence.
The superiority of socialist democracy over bourgeois democracy.
The fundamental values of socialism.
Two worlds -- two ways of life.
The suppression of working people's rights and freedoms in the capitalist world.
Mass unemployment in capitalist countries.
The antidemocracy of the bourgeois electoral system.
The antipeople nature of bourgeois democracy.
The struggle waged by the CPSU and the Soviet state to maintain peace and prevent nuclear catastrophe.
Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's 24 November 1983 statement is a vivid expression of the firm, resolute, and consistent peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.
The unity and cohesion of the socialist community countries is a most important factor in the struggle to maintain peace.
U.S. imperialism is the enemy of peace, progress, and freedom.
The U.S. Administration's adventurist militarist course is the main threat to the cause of peace.
Strengthening our country's economic and defense might is Soviet people's patriotic and international duty.
The Soviet Army is the reliable custodian of Soviet people's peaceful labor.
The year of 1984 is an important stage in the struggle to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the tasks of the 11th 5-Year Plan.
The tasks of our collective in the fourth year of the 5-year plan.
Our enterprise's counterplan.
Let us conduct livestock wintering in a model way.
Attention and care must be given to the next harvest.
Personal contributions to the 5-year plan.
Let us mark the USSR Supreme Soviet elections with new labor achievements!

MORE ELECTORAL COMMISSION NOMINATIONS REPORTED

PM231544 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian in its 23 December Morning Edition frontpages a 1,200-word TASS report headed "Nomination of Representatives to Electoral Commissions," listing nominations to electoral commissions for the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities elections made at meetings held on 21 December. The report lists nominations of, among others, workers, minor officials, and farmers from the RSFSR, Moldavia, Latvia, Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Armenia, Turkmenia, and Estonia, including the following:

Fleet Admiral G.M. Yegorov, chairman of the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee, nominated by the DOSAAF Presidium to the RSFSR Commission;

E.A. Yakubaytis, vice president of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences, nominated by the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences to the Latvian SSR Commission.

MOSCOW RAYON REPORT, ELECTION MEETINGS HELD

PM231209 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 83 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Implement Party Decision!"]

[Text] Report and election party conference were held yesterday in Brezhnevskiy, Voroshilovskiy, Dzerzhinskiy, Leningradskiy, Lyublinskiy, Oktyabrskiy, Proletarskiy, Sverdlovskiy, and Timiryazevskiy Rayons.

Unanimously and with great enthusiasm the conference delegates elected an honorary presidium consisting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov.

The conferences focused attention on questions of the activity of rayon party organizations and their leading organs in implementing the 26th party congress decisions, the Food and Energy Programs, the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) and June (1983) Plenum decisions, and the instructions contained in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's works and speeches.

It was pointed out at the conferences that the rayons' communists, working people, and residents, like all Soviet people, fully approve and support the domestic and foreign policy being pursued by the party's Central Committee and the statement which Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, made in connection with the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe. It was emphasized that under the conditions of an international situation which has has been sharply exacerbated through the fault of the U.S. Administration, the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov are doing everything necessary to defend peace on earth and to ensure the security of our country and the Soviet people, the security of our friends and allies, and well-being and peace for other peoples and other countries. Sincere gratitude to the Communist Party and the Soviet Government for their multifaceted and fruitful activity in realizing the party's general policy, and the determination to continue directing efforts under its proven leadership toward further enhancing our socialist motherland's economic and defense might were expressed.

Collectives in all sectors of the capital's economy, it was emphasized at the conferences, are successfully making the transition to the intensive path of development. The targets and pledges for the first 11 months of this year have been successfully fulfilled.

Examining questions of improving organizational and ideological work and the forms and methods of party leadership of socioeconomic processes and developing internal party democracy in the light of the decisions of the 24th city party conference and rayon party conferences, the delegates pointed to the improved standard of organizational and political education work among the masses.

Displaying truly mass concern for further enhancing production efficiency and improving labor quality, the rayon's communists and working people are actively participating in socialist competition and making a worthy contribution to the development of movements under the slogans "Honor and glory in labor!" and "one percent more -- one day sooner."

The conference delegates are devoting great attention to studying the experience accumulated since the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum and are persistently pursuing a policy of considerably enhancing the cadres' businesslike efficiency and responsibility for the entrusted work and strict observance of plan, labor, state and party discipline. The chief things, it was emphasized at the conferences, is to investigate in practice how the party's instructions on instilling proper order in production and in all sectors of the national economy are being implemented; to show party-minded concern for introducing scientific and tehhnical achievements and saving material and labor resources; to draw attention to the fulfillment of plans, to expose the causes of shortcomings where they exist; to demand that specific persons rectify the state of affairs.

A significant place in the discussions was allocated to unresolved problems and omissions and to unutilized potential and reserves. Ways and methods to surmount the shortcomings are being jointly elaborated.

The conferences made an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the organization of ideological, educational, and propaganda work in the light of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum instructions. This work is viewed as the business of the whole party and of every communist from positions of the highest exactingness and in organic connection with party organizational and socioeconomic activity. The conference participants emphasized that the exacerbation of the international situation demands greater assertiveness of party organizations in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and manifestations of views and morals that are alien to us. It is necessary to exert profound influence on the improvement of the patriotic and international education of working people, particularly young people, and to be intolerant of violators of labor discipline, loafers, and absentees.

The communists who addressed the conferences devoted very serious attention to enhancing the standard of the political leadership of local party committees, improving their work style and methods, enhancing the militancy of primary and shop party organizations and party groups, and improving the qualitative composition of party ranks and the training of cadres.

The report and election party conferences in the capital's rayons summed up the work of party committees during the period under review and outlined an action program for the future.

The following first secretaries delivered the CPSU raykom reports: I A Tikhomolov of Brezhnevskiy Raykom, A. I. Zemskov of Voroshilovskiy Raykom, V. V. Skitev of Dzerzhinskiy Raykom, P.P. Afanasyev of Leningradskiy Raykom, A.K. Zhidkov of Lyublinskiy Raykom, Yu V. Rebrov of Oktabrskiy Raykom, A.F. Korchagin of Proletarskiy Raykom, P.P. Khilkevich of Sverdlovskiy Raykom, and V. A. Zharov of Timiryazevskiy Raykom.

At all the rayon party conferences the CPSU raykoms' activities in the period under review were deemed satisfactory.

The unanimously adopted resolutions outlined specific measures aimed at further enhancing the standard of party organizations' organizational and mass political work and the vanguard role of communists in all sectors of communist building in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's works and speeches.

With great enthusiasm the conference participants adopted greetings letters addressed to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The rayon party conference elected the new compositions of the party raykoms and the auditing commissions of the rayon CPSU organizations and the delegates to the 25th Moscow CPSU City Organization Conference.

The following candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo were elected delegates to the 25th Moscow CPSU City Organization Conference: V.I. Vorotnikov in Sverdlovskiy Rayon, P.N. Demichev in Leningradskiy Rayon, V.I. Dolgikh in Timiryazevskiy Rayon, V.V. Kuznetsov in Oktyabrskiy Rayon, B.N. Ponomarev in Voroshilovskiy Rayon, and M.S. Solomentsev in Proletarskiy Rayon.

The conferences were addressed by the following Moscow CPSU Gorkom secretaries: L.A. Borisov in Dzerzhinskiy Rayon, B.V. Nikolskiy in Lyublinskiy Rayon, A.M. Roganov in Sverdlovskiy Rayon; by these Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau members: V.I. Alidin, chief of the USSR KGB Directorate for Moscow and Moscow Oblast, in Voroshilovskiy Rayon; K.S. Buchin, chairman of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Party Commission in Timiryazevskiy Rayon; V.P. Trushin, chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Administration of Internal Affairs in Proletarskiy Rayon; and V.V. Shiryayev, chairman of the Moscow City People's Control Committee, in Leningradskiy Rayon; by these candidate members of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau: T.P. Arkhipova, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Agitprop Department, in Otkyabrskiy Rayon; and I.B. Bugayev, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Party Organizational Work Department, in Brezhnevskiy Rayon.

Participating in the conferences' work were members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, and leaders of the city's party and soviet organizations and of ministries and departments.

Plenums of the new compositions of the party raykoms were held yesterday. The following were elected secretaries of the CPSU raykoms: I.A. Tikhomolov, A.N. Belov, and K.N. Godina of Brezhnevskiy Raykom; A.I. Zemskov, T.G. Prokhorov, and V.V. Sidorov of Voroshilovskiy Raykom; V.V. Skitev, Ye.V. Selikhova, and Yu.I. Vinogradov of Dzerzhinskiy Raykom; P.P. Afanasyev, N.P. Shalygin, and T.D. Semenova of Leningradskiy Raykom; A.K. Zhidkov, A.Ya. Nemtinov, and N.I. Kozhokhin of Lyublinskiy Raykom; Yu.V. Rebrov, F.F. Svetik, and G.N. Zamytskaya of Oktyabrskiy Raykom; A.F. Korchagin, A.P. Belyanskiy, and K.V. Menshchikova of Proletarskiy Raykom; P.P. Khilkevich, A.A. Lineva, and A.A. Dmitriyev of Sverdlovskiy Raykom; and V.A. Zharov, N.M. Kalugin, and L.T. Shineleva of Timiryazevskiy Raykom.

GRISHIN ADDRESSES MOSCOW PARTY COMMITTEE MEETING

LD241829 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Dec 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Report and election conferences continue in the country. A conference of the Kalinin Rayon party organization took place in Moscow today. Questions of raising the efficiency of production, of the fullest possible utilization of economic and scientific-technological potential were in the center of attention of the conference.

Comrade Grishin, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Moscow City party committee, spoke at the conference. On the same day party conferences took place in a number of other rayons of the capital.

ARMENIAN PARTY LEADERSHIP CHANGES REPORTED

LD260923 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0827 GMT 26 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow, 26 Dec (TANJUG) -- One member and two candidate members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia have been relieved of their duties in the top party leadership of this Soviet Transcaucasian republic. This decision was adopted at a plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and announced in the republican party daily KOMMUNIST.

Lev Shustkom, general in the Transcaucasus Military District Command, has been relieved of his duties as member of the Bureau Central Committee; he is believed to have been moved to some other command outside Armenia for military reasons. Vladimir Turyan, first secretary of the Armenian Komsomol Central Committee has been relieved of his office as candidate member of the Bureau; the Central Committee elected in his place A. Topuzyan, second secretary of the republican Komsomol Central Committee. M. Arzumanyan was also relieved of his post as candidate member of the Bureau, and M. Arutyunyan, first secretary of an Armenian rayon party committee was elected to that office at the Central Committee Plenum.

(Yuriy Shatalin) was elected in Lev Shustkom's place as member of the bureau, but there are not details of what post he held hitherto.

NEW UZBEK SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM CHAIRMAN

LD201134 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Dec 83

[Text] A session of the supreme organ of the state power of Uzbekistan took place in Tashkent today. In connection with his election to the post of the first secretary of the republican Communist Party Central Committee, Deputy Usmankhodzhayev has been released from his duties as chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Deputy Salimov, who worked as secretary of Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, has been elected chairman of the Presidium.

Certain changes to the composition of the Presidium and to the permanent commissions of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet were made during the session.